

THE  
MONTHLY REPOSITORY  
OF  
*Theology and General Literature.*

No. XCIII.

SEPTEMBER.

[Vol. VIII.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*Memoir of the late Rev. Hugh  
Worthington.*

[We have already, through the prompt kindness of an able and much respected correspondent, given (p. 545—550) an Obituary of Mr. Worthington, but we are tempted, by our respect for his memory, to extract from another work, [The *Universal Magazine*] the following Memoir, which, as the signature will inform many of our readers, is from the pen of the Rev. Jeremiah Joyce, Esq.]

The Rev. HUGH WORTHINGTON, son of a gentleman of the same name,\* was born at Leices-

\* The Rev. Hugh Worthington, A. M. died October 29, 1797, at the age of 86, having been pastor of a congregation of dissenters at Leicester, nearly sixty years. This gentleman was born at Balshaw-outwood, near Stockport, Cheshire. He was educated by Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Eaton, of that place, who, some time after this, removed to Nottingham. In 1734 he went to Glasgow, where he took his degree of M. A. He settled as dissenting minister first at Lecke, in Staffordshire; thence, in 1738, he removed to London, was chosen librarian to Dr. Williams's Trust, in Red-cross Street, and pastor to the society at Newington Green; and in 1741, or 2, he was unanimously appointed to succeed the Rev. Mr. Watson, at Leicester. He was author of a Funeral Discourse for the Rev. Mr. Dawson, of Hinckley: Three Charges delivered at the Ordination of young Ministers, of which one was at Salters' Hall, in 1782: an Address to his Countrymen, during the Seven Years' War, and a volume of Sermons on practical Subjects.—(See Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, vol. iv. for a Memoir of this gentleman.)

VOL. VIII.

4 D

ter, on the 21st of June, 1752, old style; or, according to the new mode of reckoning, which commenced in the following September, on the 2d of July.† He received the elements of education at home, entirely under the instruction of his father, and was distinguished, from a very early period, by the quickness of his parts, and the strength of his memory. At the age of sixteen, when he had, by the fostering care of an indulgent but vigilant parent, attained to a considerable knowledge of the classics and the Hebrew language, and also of the

† The Gregorian, or *new style*, was invented by Pope Gregory XIII. The difference between the *old* and *new* style is this: the former is calculated on the supposition that the length of the year is 365 days, 6 hours; but the latter is reckoned according to the true length of the year, which is only 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes. In the year of Christ, 200, there was no difference of styles; but, in 1580, the difference was 10 days, hence Pope Gregory ordered that, in all Catholic countries, these days should be taken out of the calendar, and that, for instance, the 1st of January should be called the 11th, and so on. This alteration did not obtain in England till 1752, when the difference was 11 days; and, by Act of Parliament, it was ordained that the mode of reckoning should be so far altered, that the 3d of September should be called the 14th; of course the 21st of June would be reckoned the 2d of July.

lower branches of mathematics, he went to Daventry, to pursue, under the late Dr. Ashworth,\* those studies which are esteemed necessary to qualify a young man for the duties of the dissenting ministry—a profession to which he had devoted himself, with the consent and entire approbation of his father, on a conviction of its great utility. There are those living, who, as his contemporaries and fellow-students, were the witnesses of the early career of his studies for the sacred ministry, and who bear the most ample and decisive testimony, not only to the irreproachableness of his moral conduct, but who add, that

---

\* Dr. Caleb Ashworth was born in Lancashire, in 1709, was a student under Dr. Doddridge, and eventually his successor. He died in July, 1775. See a Sermon on the occasion of his death, by the Rev. Samuel Palmer, who mentions that Dr. Ashworth had desired that no character might be given of him: "But," says Mr. Palmer, "if it had not been for this prohibition, nothing more needed to have been said, than that he was the immediate successor of the illustrious Dr. Doddridge, and was nominated by him to this office." Mr. Worthington in his *Memoir of Mr. Crabb*, to be noticed hereafter, says, "Dr. Ashworth was a man, who, though not distinguished by that acumen of genius and vigour of imagination, which some have possessed, yet by strong sense, inflexible resolution and indefatigable labour, acquired a store of theological learning, not often exceeded, and through a long train of years discharged the office of Divinity Tutor, with a respectability and a success, which have seldom been equalled." —Dr. Ashworth was author of three single Sermons: a Collection of Psalm Tunes, with an Introduction to the Art of Singing: a Collection of Anthems: an Hebrew Grammar: an easy Introduction to Plane Trigonometry, of which an enlarged edition was published, in the author of the *Scientific Dialogues*, by 1803.

his habits of industry, regularity, and almost incessant diligence, in the pursuit of knowledge were singularly exemplary. Independently of the learned languages, and the branches of sciences taught in dissenting-colleges, he spent much of his time in the study of the works of those divines who had flourished in the preceding century, and who were distinguished for their talents and zeal in the cause of Christian truth; and so satisfied was he of the vast importance of this kind of reading, that in his Address to the Students of the New College,† he says, "Let me exhort you frequently to read the practical writers of the last age. Some of their sentiments may not accord with your's or mine; but there is a fervour of piety breathing through all their works, which no modern improvements in knowledge or elegance can supersede, and which will be of infinite service to us, in all our prayers and discourses."

Mr. Worthington, while a student at Daventry, was likewise a great reader of sermons: he was well acquainted with the merit of all the writers who were distinguished in this sort of composition: he did not read them for mere amusement, but for the purpose of imbibing in his own mind whatever was excellent in Tillotson, in Clarke, in Bates, in Seed, in Jortin, and many other preachers, in and out of the pale of the established church. It was his custom on each returning Sunday, before he was himself called to the pulpit, not only to attend the duties of public worship, with the

---

† See a Sermon preached at the Old Jewry, May 6th, 1789.

most religious punctuality, but to peruse six or eight, or sometimes more, sermons with so much care as to be able on the next day, to give from memory, a luminous view of the subjects treated on; an analysis of the arguments by which all the duties had been enforced, and the doctrines illustrated and defended, and to state with that accuracy and precision, for which he was ever remarkable, all the practical inferences deduced by each author from the topics discussed. By this method, and with the aid of his most retentive memory, he laid up stores of knowledge, peculiarly adapted to his future usefulness as a preacher.

When he had been at Daven-try the usual course of five years, he was chosen assistant tutor in the classical department, but in the interval between the completion of his own studies, and the commencement of his duty as tutor, he came to London, on a visit to his friends; and being invited to assist some of them in the pulpit, his fame instantly spread, and he was regarded as the most popular preacher among the class of Dissenters in which he had enrolled himself. Scarcely had he commenced the business of classical tutor, when he was invited to become assistant-preacher at Salters' Hall, in connection with the Rev. Francis Spilsbury, who had been pastor to the congregation assembling there, for more than thirty years.

Mr. Worthington accepted the invitation, and began his services at Salters' Hall, on the 1st of January, 1774, having succeeded to that place by the resignation of the Rev. Hugh Farmer, the cele-

brated author of treatises on the "Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness:"—on "Miracles:"—on the "Dæmoniacs of the New Testament;" and on "The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Antient Heathen Nations."

The youthful preacher instantly drew crowds to hear him; and though the duties which he performed were those of the afternoon, the place was always full, and the hearers attentive and serious. He had, from his first appearance in the pulpit, in his manner and in his discourses, that kind of eloquence which arrested the attention, and which effectually prevented the listlessness and languor that are too frequently observable in afternoon congregations. The popularity which he acquired at the outset of life, never once deserted him.

He appeared before the public as an author, for the first time, in the year 1775, when he published, at the desire of his hearers, a sermon which he had preached on the 28th of May, entitled "A Good Character better than a Great Fortune."

On the 1st of January, 1778, he was called to preach a sermon for the benefit of a charity-school, which had been established nearly a century in Gravel-lane, Southwark. This sermon was published; the subject is "The Progress of moral Corruption," from the words of St. Paul;—"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." He considers the text as a *proverbial saying*, very common at the period when used by the apostle, and shews its application to states, churches, families and individuals. With regard



to the latter, he points out in a forcible manner, that it is by no means a matter of trivial importance, whether we guard the avenues of the heart, or indulge the early risings of vice, and hence he infers that persons should eradicate as quickly as possible, the first appearance of evil.—“Either,” says he, “we must conquer this, or it will get the mastery of us. If the weeds are not extracted from a corn field, they will soon overpower and destroy the grain. He that yields to a small temptation, little suspects what mischief and ruin he brings upon himself: that every compliance strengthens the force of seduction, and diminishes the native vigour of the mind; that habit increases by indulgence, and a three-fold cord is not easily broken; that familiarity with sin utterly extinguishes the love of God, zeal in his service, and delight in his ordinances; and where the love of God is extirpated, or devotion sinks into formality, the agency of his holy spirit is withdrawn, and a man is left to struggle by himself, amidst the tossing waves of appetite, and the dreadful rocks of temptation—like a ship torn from her cable. Is it any wonder, that in such a case, we descend to actions the very name of which would formerly have petrified the soul with horror?”

On the 5th of November, in the same year, he preached a sermon, to the supporters of the Sunday Evening Lecture at Salters' Hall,\* which was very soon after

---

\* This lecture was carried on several years, by Mr. Worthington, in conjunction with the Rev. Dr. Rees: and it was customary for the preachers on every alternate 5th of November, to deliver a discourse on the subject of Popery. On

published, under the title of “Christianity, an easy and liberal System; that of Popery, absurd and burdensome.” The object of this discourse was intended to excite in Protestants a horror of the principles of Popery, and it was certainly well calculated to answer the purpose. We believe, however, and, indeed, are very sure, that the principles of the present race of Roman Catholics are very different from those which five-and-thirty years ago, the preacher confidently ascribed to them, adding in his animated language, which the writer of this perfectly remembers to have heard, “We must be strangely ignorant of Popery, if we do not know that religious persecution is essential to its nature. And could it once get a footing in this kingdom again, you might read, by the *light of Smithfield fires*, the truth of what I have asserted.”—We will venture to affirm that, had Mr. Worthington been called to a like office, in the latter years of his life, he would not have so treated the Catholics, nor have imputed to them, as he then did,

---

the 5th of November, 1779, Dr. Rees preached an excellent sermon, “On the Obligation and Importance of searching the Scriptures, as a Preservative from Popery,” which was published, at the request of the Society.

When Dr. Rees resigned his connection with the lecture, the Rev. Thomas Morgan, and the Rev. James (now Dr.) Lindsay, were chosen to carry it on with Mr. Worthington. Mr. Morgan, on the 5th of November, 1799, preached an interesting sermon, on “The Predicted Stability and Permanence of Christianity, illustrated by historic testimony.” This admirable discourse, which is full of historical information, was published at the desire of the supporters of the lecture.



in the language of Bishop Burnet, a "pleasure in *doing* what *Protestants* cannot bear to hear." He would probably look back upon this discourse with emotions of concern and regret: it should, however, be observed that the zeal manifested by Mr. Worthington, on this occasion, was not at all peculiar to him, it was almost the general characteristic of the age.

In the year 1780, Mr. Worthington published "An Essay on the Resolution of Plane Triangles, by common Arithmetic; with a new and concise Table adapted to the Purpose;" which as it must necessarily be of very limited application in mathematical pursuits, was not, it is presumed, much inquired after. As, however, this little tract is not generally known, it may be right to mention, that it is divided into three sections: the first contains an enumeration of the principal rules for the resolution of plane triangles, without recurring to tables of sines, tangents or secants: in the second, the author shews the grounds on which these rules are built; and the third is principally devoted to the explanation of the nature of the table mentioned in the title-page. An appendix contains some equations intended as *formulae* for the solution of triangles.

About this time, or, perhaps, a year or two before, he announced, as preparing for publication, "A plain Account of Fluxions, in which the Doctrine of Conic Sections, and the Problems of Natural Philosophy are omitted; for the Use of Learners." This work, which was afterwards mentioned by the author among his actually exist-

ing publications,\* was never given to the world, and probably never printed.

The Rev. Francis Spilsbury, whom Mr. W. denominates his "father in the gospel," died, after a short illness, on the third of March, 1782. On this occasion Mr. Worthington delivered an Oration at his interment, in Bunhill Fields, and he likewise preached a Sermon, on the following Sunday, both of which were published. Of these the former is the most striking, pathetic and impressive. In both he speaks with the utmost respect and affection of his deceased friend; but it ought not to be passed over without notice, that though he had been an assistant preacher with him more than eight years, and on terms of such intimate friendship, that he exclaims, in the discourse just mentioned,—"I have lost the guide of my youth, to whose counsel I had always access, and beneath whose fostering wing I have reposed for years;" yet he could not tell the congregation what were his sentiments on disputed and important doctrinal points. Notwithstanding the respect due to the character of Mr. Spilsbury, as a practical preacher, and a pious and exemplary character, still it cannot redound to his praise, that he preached to, and lived among a people forty years, as this divine did, and yet leave his hearers, and most intimate friends, ignorant of opinions on interesting theological topics.

At the age of seventy-six, it should seem, according to Mr.

---

\* See the last leaf of the *Ordination Services*, printed in 1782.

Worthington's account, a matter of doubt whether Mr. S. were attached to the doctrines of Calvin or Arminius, whether he was a Trinitarian or an Arian, for no one, at that period, would suspect him of the species of Unitarianism, which admits only of the simple humanity of Christ.

On the death of this gentleman, who was universally respected, and who, "instead of amusing the flock of God with things of a trivial nature, or perplexing them with those of a controversial kind, insisted upon plain practical subjects," Mr. Worthington was chosen to succeed to the pastoral office, and on the 15th of the following May was, with Mr. Robert Jacomb, ordained. The service was performed at Salters' Hall; and the principal officiating ministers were the Rev. Dr. Kippis, who preached from the words of the apostle Paul, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ:" the Rev. Dr. Rees, the Rev. Michael Pope, and the Rev. Hugh Worthington, senior, who delivered a charge, founded on the words, "Make full proof of thy ministry," which contained a number of excellent observations and much good advice. The Sermon and Charge, together with the questions put by Mr. Pope to the candidates for ordination, and their respective Answers, which were, in general, liberal† and manly, were published.

\* See the Funeral Sermon above referred to.

† Mr. Jacomb was a few years morning preacher at Salters' Hall: he afterwards removed to Leicester, as assistant to the Rev. Hugh Worthington, senior, whom he afterwards succeeded, as pastor to the society. Mr. Jacomb, in his

In the summer of this year, Mr. Worthington married Susanna, the eldest daughter of the Rev. Samuel Statham, of Nottingham, a lady in whom were united an excellent and cultivated understanding, and a mildness of manners and disposition, adapted to render the marriage life a state of mutual comfort and happiness. By her he had two daughters, both of whom died within a few hours of their births. This amiable and excellent lady, after a long illness, died in the month of March, 1806.

Very early in the year 1786, a plan was formed to establish an academical institution, in the neighbourhood of London, for the education of ministers and others. Mr. Worthington was one of nine persons selected as a Committee to consider and arrange the means for carrying the plan into execution. An appeal was made to the Dissenters at large, for their approbation and pecuniary assistance in the promotion of this scheme. Several thousand pounds were, in a short time, subscribed; tutors were chosen; and the lectures commenced in the month of September, 1786, at the library in Red-cross Street.

Mr. Worthington undertook the classical department, with which were connected the study of logic and other branches of knowledge. He attended, during that session, three times a week, and also twice or thrice a week after the college was opened at Hackney. In the spring of 1789, he sent in his re-

answers referred to, avowed himself a believer in the horrible doctrine of the Eternity of Hell Torments, a doctrine from which the mind of his colleague, at Salters' Hall, was ever abhorrent.

signation, to which he was compelled, he said, "by the great increase of students, and the pressure of his own personal concerns."

Previously to his quitting the connection, he was called upon to preach the Annual Sermon before the supporters of the institution. To this sermon, which was published, we have already had occasion to refer.—The object of it was to recommend the "Union of Knowledge and Goodness," which he observed, "comprehends every thing we can conceive of, as amiable in the nature and attributes of the Deity." In comparing the present state of the country with what it had formerly been, he says,—“Many writers have taken upon them to condemn the present age, without reserve, because they can trace among us some vices which had little or no appearance in the last century, or possibly at a much later period, when they themselves were children. But these persons forget that virtues and vices, like sea and land, often change places with each other, though they cannot exchange natures. In one place the sea trenches on the land, and swallows up a large tract of it; but then, in another, it retreats just as much, and leaves a valuable portion of solid ground. So in one century, vices spring up, which in the preceding were scarcely observable; and on the contrary, those which formerly prevailed and were enormous, now almost disappear. And if we compare the present state of this country, with what historians record of its manners under the reign of Charles II. shall we not discern, that in his time, this nation had

more drunkenness, obscenity and profaneness than now? But on the contrary, is there not, in the present day, a spirit of refinement, dissimulation and luxury gone forth, which enervates both the moral and political body? The former assailed the temple of virtue by storm, the latter secretly undermines the foundation. From these things it surely appears, that an exact estimate of the virtue and vice of any country is a calculation which requires many data. Whoever praises or condemns the age he lives in, in an unqualified manner, or, as we usually say, in the gross, entirely misses the truth, and exposes his own weakness.”—He then proceeds to shew in what respects the world is better than it formerly was: that the arts and sciences have been more cultivated: the laws amended: war is conducted with less cruelty: the spirit and power of the Inquisition have declined: and liberty, civil and religious better understood. Yet he would not compliment the age with a character for greater *seriousness*, compared with what it had been, unless, said he, “you include the instances wherein it is wretchedly disfigured by the nonsense of enthusiasm.” The preacher goes on to speak, with just and becoming indignation, against the *apathy* of those who “profess religion, but understand nothing about it: who are decent, because not tempted by their connections to be profane: who are Dissenters or members of the Establishment, just as their fathers were before them.”

“Now, from this apathy,” says he, “many are awakened; but it is to enthusiasm, absurdity, blind zeal and superstitious wor-



ship. They hold *doctrines* which are irrational and contemptible, and which make religion the object either of disgust or of terror: doctrines which, if true, would rob the Deity of his glory, for they infringe upon justice, and annihilate mercy; doctrines which, by representing God as partial, serve only to make one man proud and another despairing; in a word doctrines which necessarily transfer all our obligations of gratitude, love and confidence, from the Father of spirits to some other being. Their want of charity is, if possible, still worse than their creed. Blessed be God, we live in times when they cannot proceed to the cruelties of a Bonner, or a Jeffries; they cannot erect a scaffold, or light the faggots. But though they may not burn the bodies, they consign over to damnation the souls of all who differ from them in speculative opinions. Yes; were the keys of the kingdom of heaven lodged in their hands, not a single Christian would be suffered to enter that state, who could not pronounce 'Shibboleth' as they do. And what are the *preachers* they follow? Men of such total ignorance, that they rail at learning, and call reason carnal, though God gave the one, and appointed the other. Men, who build a system of divinity upon a figure, an allusion, a detached word or two; who quote the scripture by sound, instead of sense; and who strain the types of the Old Testament till every judicious Christian blushes, and every infidel triumphs. In short, men who, with violent rant, distorted countenance and ridiculous gesture, convert the pulpit into a stage of buffoonery."

The discourse from which these extracts have been taken, is, in many respects, extremely valuable; and though the Institution, in behalf of which it was composed and delivered, has long since dropped, yet the sermon should not be forgotten. It ought neither to be buried with the institution, nor with its author.\* Those who assume to themselves the care of his reputation, would do well to reprint it, together with that "On the Progress of Moral Corruption;" and, perhaps, some others that will redound to his credit as a rational and impressive preacher.†

---

\* Mr. Worthington, in this discourse, p. 39, laments that the situation of a London minister excludes the important duty of catechising children, who are usually sent into the country for education. Catechising children, however important, is not to be compared with another, too much neglected, duty, viz. that of lecturing young people on doctrinal subjects, and, more especially, on the evidences of natural and revealed religion. "The period," says Mr. W. "from fifteen to twenty is a season of great danger, and for learning the most valuable things, it includes the best five years of any man's life." Now London abounds more than any other place, in subjects of this age, and ministers would do well to fix their attention on topics of serious and vital importance, and thus draw them from frivolity, and guard them from vicious propensities, to which there are numberless temptations in this great city. Some preachers, like Mr. Worthington, and his first colleague, in the Evening Lecture, still occupying a highly important place in the church, can, by their peculiar talents, interest the feelings and direct the views of young persons to subjects of rational enquiry, by means of their pulpit discourses only; but, in general, this object will be best attained by familiar lectures.

† The writer of this article would be glad to see, in print, a series of five Discourses on a Future State, which he

In the year 1795, Mr. Worthington drew up a brief but interesting Memoir of his late friend and fellow student the Rev. Habakkuk Crabb, which was prefixed to a volume of posthumous sermons published for the benefit of the author's orphan children. In this Memoir, Mr. Worthington speaks with becoming indignation, of the treatment which his friend had met with, from one of the congregations with which he had been connected, "because he preferred scriptural language to human phrases," contrasting their behaviour with the kindness and liberality which he afterwards experienced, "in a serious, enlightened and affectionate congregation at Royston, an ASYLUM perfectly adapted to his wishes, and where he continued till his death." Those who remember Mr. Crabb, will not fail to connect the name of Nash, with the happiness which the deceased minister enjoyed, during the latter years of his life.

In 1796, he became morning preacher at the chapel of Hanover Street, Long Acre, and continued his services several years, so far as those services were compatible with the pastoral duties at Salters' Hall. And, upon his retiring, the congregation presented him with a piece of plate, of the value of sixty guineas as a token of respect and gratitude, for the benefits which they and their families had derived from his ministry among them.

Mr. Worthington's father died, in the year 1797, at the advanced age of eighty-eight; the son had,

remember to have heard Mr. Worthington deliver, full thirty years ago, first in the afternoon, and then at the evening lecture.

some years before edited a Volume of his Sermons, and upon his decease he wrote a Biographical Memoir, that appeared in the Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, and also in the Monthly Magazine, for the month of November, in the same year. In this memoir were promised an additional volume of his father's sermons, and a more full and enlarged life of the venerable man. That he did not perform this act of filial duty, was, we have been informed, on account of some family reasons, which he did not think it necessary to explain.

Mr. Worthington was a considerable adept in the art of Short-hand writing, and had employed much of his time in improving upon the system which he had learnt in early life. He had studied the subject with great care; at one time he had made considerable progress in a work upon it, and had caused several plates to be engraved, with the view to a publication on strictly scientific principles, but the book has never been given to the world.

In December, 1805, Mr. Worthington published a discourse, which he had preached on the day of thanksgiving, appointed to commemorate Lord Nelson's victory, obtained over the combined fleets of France and Spain, on the 21st day of the preceding October.

In the beginning of this sermon, he laid down four preliminary cautions, viz,—that amidst all our rejoicings, there must be no pride or self-conceit:—no malignity against enemies:—no inhuman delight in war:—and no presumptuous confidence as to futurity. He next specified some of the great things which God has done for this country, and, inde-



pendently of victories over our enemies, we have reason, he said, to be very grateful for *our insular situation:—our climate:—our commerce:—our attainments in science and literature:—and our privileges, with regard to civil and religious freedom.*

In speaking of the death of Lord Nelson, he says, "The Eternal Disposer of events has, on this occasion, most awfully proclaimed the truth, *that he is alike able to save and destroy.* Interesting lesson! In the very moment of victory, he has withdrawn the instrument by which he wrought it; unnerved the arm which had just been directing the British thunder; and for ever closed the eye, which day and night used to watch over our safety and happiness."

In adverting to the religious improvement that national mercies demand, the preacher exclaimed, "The man that will not sincerely and ardently pray for his country, deserves not to breathe its air: let him go to a clime, the atmosphere of which is as frigid as his own soul."

Mr. Worthington published some other sermons, to which the writer of this article has not access: one of these was preached before the "Corresponding Board, in London, for erecting Schools, and propagating the Gospel in the Highlands:" another was a Sermon preached in behalf of the Charity-school in Wood Street, Spital Fields.

His avocations, as a pastor of a large congregation, were numerous and frequently pressing: he was likewise engaged in several public trusts: of the Presbyterian Fund he was an active member: and at Salters' Hall he had

preached more than forty sermons, in recommendation of that excellent charity: he had also preached, for the same purpose, at the chapels in Princes Street, Westminster; Hanover Street, Long Acre; Leather Lane, Holborn; perhaps, likewise at other places, and upon these occasions the collections were always considerable. Mr. Worthington, was a patron to the Orphan Working School, in the City Road; and he had been one of the trustees to Dr. Williams's estates and library twenty-eight years.

For many years, previously to his decease, he had been afflicted with ill health, which probably prevented him from those extra exertions, in the way of literature, which, in many cases, seem not only compatible with the profession of a dissenting minister, but which are likely to augment a minister's happiness, by rendering him more independent of the people among whom he labours. A dissenting minister, to be useful in the highest possible degree, to say nothing of his own personal ease and comfort, should *be*, and *feel* perfectly independent of his hearers, nor suffer himself to be dictated to, as to the doctrines which he thinks it his duty to promulgate and insist upon. He has, in general, a better opportunity for pursuing speculative enquiries, than those who attend upon his ministry, because he is enabled, by the support which he derives from his office, to devote a considerable portion of time to enquiries connected with his profession, and he should claim, as his right, the utmost freedom in stating the progress of his convictions; for if a man be



cramped in this respect, he will feel himself in trammels not easily endured.

The subject of this article was, unquestionably, as far as pecuniary matters were concerned, perfectly independent, and could have quitted the connection in which he was, without in the smallest degree deranging his domestic comforts; yet his habits were such that he could not, or, probably, thought he could not, quit his station at Salters' Hall without hazarding his future peace and happiness, and therefore endured, for a considerable time, that sort of interference to which we have alluded, but not without deeply lamenting it. He felt there were persons of weight and consequence, in his congregation, who were suspicious that his sentiments were not so sound as they ought to be, or as they used to be. This fact is not mentioned with the smallest ill-will to any individual; the writer scarcely knows the persons whose names have been mentioned in connection with it, and is certainly not sufficiently known to any one of them, to take the liberty of offering the commonest salutation in passing them in the street; but he is induced to make the remark, knowing what Mr. Worthington felt on the subject, and in order that the hint may be useful to other persons who stand in similar relations.

In the case of Mr. Worthington, the suspicion was perfectly groundless: few men ever changed their religious opinions less than he. He began life an Arian,\*

\* Of Mr. Worthington's class fellows at Daventry, two, viz. the Rev. Edward Dewhurst (see an account of this

with regard to the person of Christ; and was from his first entrance in the pulpit avowedly inimical to the gloomy doctrines of Calvinism. That he was not in the least careful to conceal these opinions all his stated hearers can testify. As far back as the year 1777, the writer of this article can look,

gentleman, in the memoir of his very extraordinary son, vol. vii. of the *Monthly Repository*;) and the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, were originally, like himself, Arians. Mr. Dewhurst continued in the same faith, till his death, and Mr. Carpenter is almost the only person who, of late years, has thought Arianism worth defending, by means of the press.—(See vol. ii. &c. of the *M. Repository*.) The others, viz. the Rev. Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, and the Rev. S. S. Toms, of Framlingham, were Calvinists when they went to Daventry, but are now decided Unitarians in the strict sense of the term.

In proof of Mr. Worthington's zeal for the doctrine of Arianism, we may observe that, in 1789, he devised a plan to stop the progress of Unitarianism, which he and others, by a misnomer, denominated Socinianism. A meeting was held at Chapel House, Oxfordshire, which consisted of, the Rev. H. Worthington, of London; the Rev. B. Carpenter, of Stourbridge; the Rev. H. Crabb, of Cirencester; the Rev. Mr. Geary, of Beaconsfield, and one or two others. Previously to the assembling of this synod, it was determined that one was to write a dissertation on "The Person of Christ;" another on "The Personality of the Holy Spirit;" a third on "The Atonement," and so on. Unfortunately, the subject of *INSPIRATION* was started, and it was found, that the reverend divines, who were about to crush Priestley, Belsham and others, could not agree among themselves on this, which was regarded as the fundamental point from which they were to set out. After three days debate the meeting was dissolved, and the several individuals, it is believed, separated from one another, very much dissatisfied with their performance. The actors in it were afterwards always shy of speaking on the subject.

and he well remembers, that though the sermons of this favourite preacher were uniformly practical, yet he not unfrequently found occasion to give what, at that time, his hearer esteemed severe and fatal blows, in the same discourse to the Trinitarian and Socinian; and at others he did not deal less severely with the doctrines of Calvinism and Philosophical Necessity. It must be much more than 30 years ago, that he heard him with a delight, of which the impression is not obliterated, descant on the latter subjects, when discoursing from the pathetic exclamation of Christ, "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered together your children, &c. BUT YE WOULD NOT."

To within a fortnight of his death, Mr. Worthington, though worn down with disease, and labouring under a pulmonary complaint, was the same animated preacher that he had ever been. When employed in the pulpit, he forgot himself and his bodily infirmities, and had no other feeling but the desire of being useful.

After the last public service in which he engaged, on the 11th of July, he left London for Worthing, in the hope of being benefitted by a change of air. Occasionally he felt partial amendments, but he almost uniformly thought that he was rapidly hastening to the end of his journey, of which he gave intimations to several of his friends. On Sunday, the 25th, he attended public worship, and retired to his chamber at the usual hour. About five o'clock on the following morning he was seized with an expectation of blood; he had strength

enough only to warn his friend of his sudden indisposition. They came in a few minutes to his bed-side; he was composed and cheerful; but upon the hope being expressed that he would soon find himself better, he replied, with his usual emphasis, "No, never: I now feel as I never felt before." Soon after, he uttered his last words, "*Gracious Father, forgive me, and receive me to thyself;*" and in a very short time he died without a groan or struggle.\*

His body was brought from Worthing to his house in London, and in the evening of the 5th of August it was removed to Salters' Hall, the principal scene which had been witness to his labours for forty years within a few months; from thence it was taken on the next day to Bunhill Fields, and interred in the same vault that contains the remains of Mrs. Worthington and other branches of his family. The funeral service was performed by the Rev. Thomas Tayler, and the whole was conducted at the expence of the congregation. Eighteen mourning coaches and several private carriages followed the hearse; and there were, probably, not

---

\* For several weeks it was believed that Mr. Worthington had died without a will, it is however now certain that he executed one, only two or three days before he left London for Worthing. He kept a Diary, written in a short-hand of his own, which was an improvement upon Palmer's method, and in that diary he says he had signed his will, on a given day, and that, to prevent accidents, a copy would be found, attached to certain letters. The copy has been found, and though in short-hand, will, it is hoped, prove a legal instrument.



less than two thousand spectators in the burying-ground, of whom many, no doubt, assembled from motives of curiosity, but others, and those the larger number by much, attended for the purpose of paying a tribute of respect to the memory of the deceased, and to mark, by this feeble but sincere testimony, how much they were affected by the loss of him who had occupied, so usefully, a most important post in society.

On the following Sunday, an eloquent and very pathetic funeral sermon was delivered to the congregation by the Rev. Dr. Lindsay, which, we trust, will be given to the public. The Rev. Henry Lacey, the morning preacher at Salters' Hall, preached on the same occasion; as did the Rev. John Evans,\* at Worship-Street. The Rev. Thomas Belsham, of Essex-street chapel, referred, in a sermon, with regret, as well for the public, as himself, to the loss of his very old friend and fellow student. Dr. Toulmin, in a discourse preached on the same day, at St. Thomas's Meeting, in Southwark, did not fail to improve the solemn event: and an occasional preacher, the Writer of this Memoir, at the Old Jewry chapel, in Jewin Street, who had been one of Mr. Worthington's pupils, at the close of a discourse from the words selected from the book of Job, "*If a man die, shall he live again?*" introduced the following observations:—

"Some of us, in the course of

\* The interesting sermon, preached by Mr. Evans, entitled, "*Usefulness the great Object of the Christian Ministry,*" to which we invite the attention of our readers, is published by Sherwood and Co. Paternoster Row.

the last week, have seen committed to the cold and cheerless tomb, the remains of one who had been forty years distinguished as a popular and most useful preacher in this city. His death would not, I am sure, have passed unregarded in this place, had the health of your excellent and venerable pastor allowed him to have occupied, at this moment, his own pulpit. I pretend not to supply the deficiency which his absence necessarily occasions. I feel that I am wholly unable to do justice to those talents, which I look back upon with respect and the most unfeigned regard, yet I will not pass by the circumstance entirely in silence.

"The death of Mr. Worthington cannot fail of exciting emotions of sensibility in the breasts of those who have witnessed his exertions in the pulpit, and who have been instructed by his discourses. Since he became a preacher in the metropolis, a new generation has sprung up, on whom his public labours must have had a considerable effect in forming the moral character. There was a peculiarity in his manner, as well in his prayers, as in his sermons, which was entirely his own, which none could imitate, and which, if it did not accord with a correct taste and refined judgment, was remarkably striking and impressive, and particularly adapted to the sententious style of his compositions.

"The devotional parts of his services were well calculated to awaken in the thoughtless, and to animate in the serious part of his audience, those devout and grateful feelings which are essen-



tial to acceptable worship. His sermons were instructive, plain, scriptural, and adapted to the young.—Almost all of them abounded with short and energetic sentiments, that might be treasured up in the mind as striking and important axioms, easily remembered, and of great practical utility in life. What he uttered, seemed to come from the heart, and instantly made its way to the hearts of his hearers. He interested persons of all ages, but the young were particularly captivated by that earnestness and zeal which he ever displayed in recommending to their attention the duties of religion.

“With what ardour did he, from the commencement of his public ministry, warn others still less advanced in the progress of life than himself, against the seductions of vice!—In what striking colours would he exhibit the folly and danger of those who did not, as far as it was possible, avoid the enticements and company of those who had lost their own character, and who were running down the road to destruction. He studied the human heart, and was quick in the application of his knowledge to the purposes of moral instruction. Hence he was perpetually urging those just embarked on the dangerous ocean of life, to mark with a firm and steady opposition, the earliest allurements intended to draw them from the path of rectitude: to be satisfied with such pleasures as were simple, innocent and manly; such as a benevolent Creator had appointed to cheer the path of life; and to have recourse to them always as a recreation, not as the main business of existence.

“He frequently and successfully exhorted young persons, in every sphere of life, to keep their eyes constantly fixed on some object that required activity of mind and energy of thought, and that might prove useful to themselves, or beneficial to others: he did not cease to admonish them, that history had transmitted no name to posterity with honour, that had not sacrificed pleasure to duty—that had not on important occasions, proved its magnanimity by self-denial, leaving the application to their own reflections.

“There are those living who recollect with pleasure, who remember with gratitude, impressions made by the discourses of Mr. Worthington, much more than thirty years ago; to which they willingly impute any little ardour they themselves have evinced in life, in the cause of virtue and sound knowledge. He, we may venture to assume, now that he is no more, seldom or never pleaded in behalf of the interests of religion in vain. By his exhortations he has warned multitudes from rocks, that would have wrecked their frail barks: he has enabled them so resist or subdue the gay passions of youth, and to put a decisive negative to the seductions of those who had themselves fallen victims to the fatal snares of unlawful pleasure.

“By means such as those, which have been very feebly described, few preachers have been more useful; and very few, as preachers, will be longer remembered. By the impressive style of his preaching, he excited in many other persons, intended for different pursuits, a desire of becoming ministers of religion, and then

readily and generously assisted them in attaining the object of their wishes. Out of pure friendship, and the desire of being useful, he has opened the road to several, and to others he has granted, or obtained for them, those aids in the way of instruction, which could not have been procured elsewhere, without any hopes, any expectation, or even any, the most distant chance of remuneration in this world.

"Of these, not one it is believed will think upon his exertions, his labours of benevolence, without emotions of gratitude; not one who would not rejoice to be situated as I, at this moment am, with the opportunity of acknowledging in public, and before a most numerous and respectable congregation, how much he is indebted to his kindness and liberality.

"Of these many are filling useful and important stations in the church; and some, one at least, who either from the want of proper talents, or from other circumstances, to which he cannot allude, without risking the charge of egotism, having been denied the place in society, which from early life he anxiously sought, is not wholly useless, in that particular way for which the late Mr. Worthington was greatly celebrated, viz. in guiding the steps of the young into the temple of knowledge. If a train of circumstances which, after all, he has no reason to regret or be ashamed of, has deprived him of what he long esteemed, and still regards, as one of the most important and useful stations in life, that of a public teacher of the Christian religion,

he cannot reproach himself with any great share of inactivity: if denied the opportunity of labouring in the cause of virtue and the promotion of true knowledge, on the first day of the week, he is teaching by his works, humble as they are, not a few on the other six. It affords him some consolation to know, that he is not wholly useless; that the gratuitous labours of his deceased friend, whose remains he, uninvited, with many others, affected by the loss, followed to the grave, have not been entirely thrown away.

"Can we think of such a man, as him to whom I have directed your thoughts, or rather to whom all our thoughts are almost naturally impelled, and yet with respect to him, and to others like him, who are actively engaged in training their fellow creatures to virtue, ask the question in the text, '*If a man die, shall he live again?*' To unassisted reason, he seems gone for ever; his place knoweth him no more; and hereafter there will be no remembrance of him, nevertheless, he will live again; and many shall rise with him, and call his name blessed. Yes! the glorious gospel, of which he was so useful and eminent a preacher, has, we fear not to assert, made it as certain that we shall all live again, as it is certain that we must die; and then we shall put away those imperfections which, in some degree or other, attach to us all, or by a course of discipline more or less severe, shall be fitted for an inheritance among the just."

J. J.

*Highgate, Aug. 17, 1813.*

*Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.*

(Continued from p. 433.)

The erection of the new range of lodging rooms had involved the institution in a debt of 1700*l*, to provide for which, a number of the Trustees, in the year 1770, engaged to furnish 100*l*. each, and to take the premises in mortgage for their security. Of course, instead of being, in a pecuniary view an advantage, they were an additional burden upon the funds of the institution.—In other respects the affairs of the academy went on without much interruption, with the three tutors, Messrs. Aikin, Holt and Enfield, and Mr Rigby, the provider of the commons, till the death of Mr. Holt, in the beginning of 1772. Of this gentleman very little information has been obtained, in addition to what is given in p. 4. He is said to have been a man of remarkably mild and gentle manners, and of an equanimity almost unparalleled; insomuch that he appears to have been scarcely capable of emotions, at least of any violent kind; to have been, in short, a sort of reasoning automaton. By what process of education he was formed to this, we have no account of his early youth to enable us to judge. When he was at Glasgow, it is reported of him that he took a walk, during one of the vacations, along the ridge called the English Apennines, till, passing along that branch of it which terminates in Rivington Pike, he came to the height which looks down upon the vale of Bolton. From hence he sent a boy to summon his brother, with whom he held a conference, and then, without descending, turned about, and marched back

to Scotland. His equanimity of mind, joined to his exact mathematical precision, gave him a great advantage in argument on metaphysical subjects, his acquaintance with which was very extensive, and of his judgment, concerning which his colleague, Dr. Aikin had a very high opinion. He was particularly exact in requiring a precise previous definition of terms made use of by his adversary; which frequently put an immediate end to the dispute. It is said to have been a sentiment of his, that he could live happy in perfect solitude, to all eternity, meditating on the perfections of the Deity.

A correspondent, to whom the writer is under great obligations, and who was one of his early pupils, does not recollect his ever being under any difficulty for illustrations in his class. Probably, like many eminent mathematicians, he might not always make sufficient allowance for the slow apprehensions of beginners, and without regarding the difficulties which he might not himself perceive, might be too apt to introduce them, prematurely, to the most abstruse parts of a science, of which it requires considerable comprehension of mind to relish even the elements. However this may be, his class was certainly not a popular one; perhaps no mathematical tutor, who is wise, will expect to make the subjects of his course as generally interesting as those of his colleagues in the business of education: in the present instance, as has been already observed, some rather impertinent hints and suggestions on the conduct of his class, appear in the Minutes of the Trustees; which it must have



required all his *sang froid* to receive with complacency, and which his successor certainly never would have borne.—He left a curious mathematical will, which excited much remark, and occasioned some perplexity, by which he bequeathed his property to his relations, in proportions, regulated by their respective degrees of proximity, without mentioning a single name, even that of his wife, who was supposed to have contributed her full share towards saving what he had to leave, and who survived him a good many years on a trifling income.

Mr. Holt was succeeded by the Rev. George Walker, F. R. S. of whom so full a biographical account has been prefixed by his Son, to his Posthumous Sermons and Miscellaneous Works, and so many tributes of respect to his memory have been inserted in the Monthly Repository, (vol. ii. p. 217, and vol. v. pp. 217, 475, 504,) that nothing further occurs to be added on the present occasion. The situation could not fail to be particularly agreeable to a man, who was not only of distinguished eminence in his own particular department, but also of great attainments in various walks of general literature, and almost unrivalled in his talent and taste for literary conversation. The emoluments, however, arising from the fees of his class, were far from answering either his expectations or his wants; and, nothing being to be expected from the funds of the Academy, a removal from his present situation, was, to a man lately married, with the prospect of an increasing family, a measure not of inclination, but necessity. He accepted

an invitation to Nottingham, in the summer of 1774.

After several ineffectual attempts to supply Mr. Walker's place, the funds being quite unequal to the offering of an adequate salary to a successor, Dr. Enfield, as has been stated, undertook the herculean task of qualifying himself, in a single vacation, under the direction of his friend Dr. Clayton, of Liverpool, to add to his former, already arduous, department, that of tutor in the mathematics and natural philosophy; Dr. Aikin relieving him from the logic and higher classics. And in consequence of Mr. Rigby's about the same time declining his situation as provider of the commons, Dr. Enfield added this also to his other cares, with little expectation of profit, at the rate of 17*l.* the session of ten months.

About this time a very pleasing addition was made to the opportunity of general information enjoyed in this institution, by the voluntary undertaking of Mr. (now Dr.) Aikin, then a young surgeon lately settled in Warrington, to give, at his own risk, to those who chose to attend him, short courses of lectures on anatomy and physiology, and on chemistry; designed to introduce into these studies those young gentlemen whose profession would require a further attention to them, and to give such a general knowledge of them to others as belongs to a course of liberal education. Something of this kind had been occasionally attempted before; Dr. Priestley, who could turn his hand to any thing, informs us in his *Memoirs*, (p. 43,) that "he one year gave a course of lectures on ana-

tomy;" and a course on chemistry had been given more than once, by Mr. Matthew Turner, an eminent apothecary and chemist in Liverpool, who was the first that prepared in the large way for sale, and introduced into general practice, the sulphuric æther. The former course must necessarily have been very imperfect; and though to the latter the philosophical world is under great obligations, as it gave Dr. Priestley his first ideas on the subject of chemistry, (Mem. p. 56), yet the mere circumstance of Mr. Turner's distant residence and various engagements required that the subject should be condensed into as few lectures as possible, and prevented frequent repetitions. It was therefore a great advantage which the students for many years enjoyed, of having these lectures regularly repeated, in alternate sessions, by a gentleman fully acquainted with his subject, to whom, and to his colleague, Dr. Enfield, may be applied, with great justice, what Johnson has said of Goldsmith,—*"Nihil tetigit quod ornavit."* The course of anatomy consisted of fifteen or twenty lectures, that of chemistry of about thirty. For the use of those who attended the former he drew up a "Sketch of the Animal Economy," which he afterwards translated into elegant Latin, with a particular view to lead students in medicine to pay more attention to the acquiring of a correct Latin style; for the latter, he published "Heads of Chemistry," a neat synopsis of the doctrines and facts then known, but now, of course, out of date; and translated Baume's Manual of Chemistry.

Perhaps this may be as proper

a place as any to mention, that, after the departure of Dr. Reinhold Foster, various unsuccessful attempts were made to engage a foreigner in the capacity of teacher of the modern language—a M. Fantin la Tour, a M. Le Maitre, alias Mara,\* and a Mr. Lewis Guery; but none of them continued for any length of time. At length, the Trustees resolved to engage Mr. Hulme, an English gentleman, who had resided abroad, who continued to teach French, and also fencing, to such as chose it, till the close of the academy. It is believed that he still resides in Warrington.

The business of the academy went on from 1774 to 1778, the two tutors continuing to perform the work of three, till, as has been mentioned, in p. 170, Dr. Aikin found it necessary to resign the

---

\* There is great reason to believe that this was the infamous Marat, the associate of Robespierre, and the victim of Charlotte Corday. It is known that he was in England about this time, and published in London a Philosophical Essay on the connection between the Body and the Soul of Man, and, somewhere in the country, had a principal hand in printing, in quarto, a work of considerable ability, but of a seditious tendency, entitled "Chains of Slavery." Mara, as his name is spelt in the Minutes of the Academy, very soon left Warrington, whence he went to Oxford, robbed the Ashmolean Museum, escaped to Ireland, was apprehended in Dublin, tried and convicted in Oxford under the name of Le Maitre, and sentenced to the Hulks at Woolwich. Here one of his old pupils at Warrington, a native of Bristol, saw him. He was afterwards a Bookseller in Bristol and failed, was confined in the goal of that city, but released by the Society there for the relief of prisoners confined for small sums. One of that Society, who had personally relieved him in Bristol goal, afterwards saw him in the National Assembly in Paris in 1792.



classical department, and Dr. Enfield was very desirous to have got rid of the office of *Rector Academiæ*, and the providing of the commons. After several unsuccessful negotiations, Mr. Houghton, just then leaving the academy, was engaged to assist Dr. Aikin for a year, and in 1779, the Rev. Gilbert Wakefield, B. A. was chosen to fill the classical department. Of this eminent scholar so complete an account has been given by himself and by the respectable continuators of his biographical Memoirs, that the present writer has only to add his own grateful recollection of the pleasure and advantage derived from his instructions. His observations on the classical writers whom he read with his pupils, were delivered in a somewhat more familiar style than those of his venerable predecessor; and consisted more of verbal criticism, illustrated (as in his Notes on Matthew, and his *Sylva Critica*) by the production of a great variety of passages where the same word is used by other authors, rather than (as was more frequently the case with Dr. Aikin) where the same sentiment is expressed. The divinity students were under particular obligations to him for voluntarily undertaking, after Dr. Aikin's death, a course of Lectures on the New Testament,

nearly the whole of which he read over with them, and thus contrived, in a most useful and acceptable way, to fill up their time during the remainder of the session.—In conjunction with Dr. Enfield and Mr. Aikin he also established (as he has related in his Life) a sort of classical club among the Students: but though several very excellent papers were read in it by the gentlemen above mentioned, which have since instructed the public under various forms, it did not flourish like those mentioned in the life of Dr. Enfield, probably from the extreme inequality of its several members, in point of classical attainment, which necessarily precluded the younger members from being any thing more than listeners to the *dicta* of their seniors.

On Dr. Aikin's death, the Rev. Nicholas Clayton, D. D. of Liverpool, was prevailed upon to become his successor in the theological chair. But as several circumstances remain to be cleared up respecting this excellent person, I must claim your indulgence for another short paper, in which I propose to finish what I have to report of the tutors at Warrington, and offer a few remarks on the causes of its failure.

I am, &c.

V. F.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

---

*Book-Worm.*—No. VIII.

SIR, Aug. 13, 1813.

The following pamphlet is still curious on account of the personages in the title-page, though the

subject of the correspondence has been exhausted by the discussions of the last century:

*A Letter against Popery: particularly against admitting the Au-*



*thority of Fathers and Councils in Controversies of Religion; by Sophia Charlotte, the late Queen of Prussia: being an Answer to a Letter written to her Majesty by Father Vota, an Italian Jesuit, Confessor to King Augustus. 1712.*

This Letter was originally, I apprehend, in the French language. The translator and publisher appears, from his Life (B. B. vi. 3973,) to have been To-land, who, at the close of a prefatory dedication *To the Lady E. G.* anagrammed his name into *Londat*. He has chosen an appropriate motto from the *Æneid* (xi. 688.) where the heroine *Camilla* thus addresses a Tuscan whom she had mortally wounded.

Nomen tamen haud leve Patrum  
Manibus hoc referes telo cecidisse Camille.

Thus correctly, though not elegantly, rendered according to *Trapp*, with a slight variation for the present purpose:

Yet to thy *Fathers'* shades,  
This solace, no small glory, shalt thou bear,  
'Tis to *Camilla's* dart thou ow'st thy death.

Sophia Charlotte is distinguished among a family, the princesses of which have, at different periods, discovered an attachment to literature and liberal theology. Queen Caroline's attentions to Clarke and Whiston are well known; and to the late princess Amelia, her daughter, Father Courayer delivered, as an acceptable present, the "Declaration of his last Sentiments," published in 1787, and in which he has maintained the proper Unitarian doctrine. Nor should Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, aunt of Sophia Charlotte,

be forgotten, who is mentioned by Penn, in his "*Travails in Holland and Germany, 1677.*" In her conferences with Penn and his associates, she displayed much religious curiosity and a serious inclination to their opinions. Dr. Kippis, in his additions to *Barclay*, (B. B. i. 601,) says of this princess, that she "had a high regard both for him and all the Quakers, and carried on a frequent correspondence with him," and that "many of her letters are preserved in the Barclay family. Two of her letters to Robert Barclay, besides one which she sent to her brother Prince Rupert, intreating him to use his interest for putting a stop to the persecution of the Quakers, and one from Barclay to her, written with a singular spirit of piety and simplicity, are printed in *A Genealogical Account of the Barclays of Urie. Aberdeen, 1740.*"

The Queen of Prussia was sister of George I. and grandmother of Frederick III. who has mentioned her more than once, with great regard, in his *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Brandenburg*. She was admired and sought in marriage by Louis XIV. but reasons of policy, perhaps of Protestantism, interposed. *On la destinoit pour le trône de France; Louis XIV. fut touché de sa beauté, mais des raisons de politique firent échouer ce mariage. Memoires ii. 31.*

They could be reasons of policy alone which united Sophia Charlotte and Frederick I. to whom she was married in 1684, at the age of 15. His grandson says of him, that he founded an academy in complaisance to his consort, and hired buffoons to please himself.

In another place, he describes Frederic I. as persuaded to found an academy because it became his *royalty*, just as a young squire, in regard to his station, should possess a kennel of hounds. The courts of these ill-matched consorts were, as might be expected, quite separate, and that of the Queen worthily distinguished by purity, learning and politeness. *C'étoit un temple où se conservoit le feu sacré des Vestales, l'azile des savans, et le siege de la politesse.* Id. 96.

Toland, on the accession of Queen Anne, became politically obnoxious to the court of London, apparently on account of his zeal for the succession in the house of Brunswick. He now travelled to the Continent, passing some time in Hanover and Prussia. There, according to his Life before quoted, he was frequently entertained by this Queen, to whom he is understood to have addressed, in 1704, his *Letters to Serena*. It is mentioned in Toland's Life, (B. B. vi.) that "Mr. L'Enfant heard him read a discourse concerning prejudices to Sophia Charlotte, before whom, at Charlottenburgh, he had a dispute with Mr. Beausobre, another of her chaplains, 'on the authority of scripture.'"

In his Preface to this translation, Toland says, on his own knowledge, that Sophia Charlotte "spoke several languages to such a degree of perfection, as made strangers call in doubt which might be her first. Her favourite subjects were divinity and philosophy; but she often used to wish they could be managed with less interestedness, passion and partiality. She gave every body a good example herself, by affording an

equal ear to all the parties engaged, and in never failing to hear, with extraordinary calmness, those absurd and frightful consequences with which they used to charge each other."

Her grandson Frederic, who himself highly admired the character of Leibnitz, describes his grandmother's attachment to that philosopher, who resided, with other learned men, by her invitation, in her court at Charlottenburgh. She is said to have remembered Leibnitz on her death-bed, in connection with the metaphysical subjects of their conversations, thus consoling one of the ladies of her court who bewailed her: *Ne me plaignez pas; car je vais, à present, satisfaire ma curiosité sur les principes des choses, que Leibnitz n'a jamais pu m'expliquer, sur l'espace, sur l'infini, sur l'être, et sur le néant.* Mem. p. 32.

Sophia Charlotte died at Hanover, on a visit to her mother the electress Sophia, Feb. 1, 1705, in the 37th year of her age, recommending, in her last moments, the learned whom she had patronised, and the arts which she had cultivated, to the protection of her brother the Elector, afterwards George the First. Nor was this recommendation ill-addressed, if, as I have somewhere read, George I., after he was raised to the British throne, had so much regard to his own improvement as to invite literary and scientific men to a weekly evening party, at his palace, where it was the established rule to take no special notice of the king, but to afford him the advantage of being treated as a man.

Dr. Towers, in his *Memoirs of Fred. III.* (2d. ed. i. 97,) relates

from Pollnitz, that "M. de la Bergerie, the minister of the French Church, who assisted Sophia Charlotte in her last moments, was so surprised at her courage and calmness, that he was more attentive to hear her than to exhort her. 'I have,' said she, 'for twenty years, seriously studied my religion, and have read the books that treated of it with too much application to be in any doubt as to my principles. You cannot mention any thing to me but what I have read, and what you can say to me will certainly add nothing to my opinion.'" Dr. T. adds, that "this princess had formed ideas of government so equitable, and so extremely different from those which prevailed in Prussia, that she was often styled by the Germans *the republican Queen*."

Such was Sophia Charlotte. Her correspondent, Father Vota, appears, by Frederic's Memoirs, to have visited the court of Prussia, in a political character, from his master the King of Poland. After a long prefatory address by Toland, the correspondence commences (p. 26) by "Father Vota's Letter to the Queen of Prussia." This letter, which is short, is dated March 3, 1703, from Stargard in Pomerania. The Father, who appears to have been now an old man, thus refers to his disputes in the Queen's presence with her chaplains:—"There still remains with me a very sensible displeasure against myself; because the obligation under which I lay to defend the honour of the first fathers of the Church, has drawn upon those gentlemen, whom otherwise I esteem and honour, answers that were proportionable to the great wrong they did to the whole pri-

mitive church, before it was divided into parties." He adds, "I flatter myself, however, that those worthy persons will still continue my good friends, as I do for them preserve a very sincere esteem, being incapable of retaining any resentment from which in reality I am exempt in the greatest warmth of disputation."

"The Queen of Prussia's Answer to Father Vota" is not dated; but was probably written on the receipt of the Jesuit's letter. After a return of compliments, Sophia Charlotte adds, "What has made the greatest impression upon me in your letter is the nice concern you shew about the little skirmishes in which you were engaged with my chaplains. Herein I discover the character of a well-bred man and a Christian, which adds no small lustre to the rare qualities of your mind. I can say as much to you on the behalf of these gentlemen, and promise that in this respect, there will be no controversy between you." The Queen proceeds, in the following passage, to describe government in Prussia more favourably than according to the opinion I have quoted from Dr. Towers. She also compliments Protestantism with an attachment to free inquiry, a character yet but partially deserved.

"I am not in the least surprised that, in a very small space of time, you have heard a world of things spoken in a country of liberty, which in a country of authority you should not have heard in forty years: for they are indeed two several countries, where very different languages are spoken. But if I may freely declare my opinion, I can pretty well inform you what



it was that insensibly led those gentlemen to forget the decorum of the fatherhood in their expressions about the fathers. As among us Protestants, men are accustomed to look upon the holy scriptures as the sole rule of faith, by which both fathers and councils are to be examined; they were not well satisfied, to be sure, that in this whole affair you attributed so little to scripture, and that you spoke in so disobliging a manner of reason, whose authority alone ought to prevail in the world, and to which you yourself have so great obligations. However, as people may continue good friends, and yet every one persist in his own sentiments, they very positively maintain, that they have advanced nothing concerning the Fathers and the Councils that has not been said and published many times before, not only by the authors of our communion, which you are not bound to acknowledge, but likewise by Roman Catholic authors, and, what surprises me most, even by Jesuits."

The Queen, to prove her point, refers to the censures passed upon Augustine by the Jesuits Adam and Annat. She then describes her chaplains as maintaining, "that we cannot rely for the sense of scripture upon authors that have explained it so negligently, and that have spoken of the apostles themselves with so little respect as did St. Jerome." On the character of councils the Queen quotes Gregory Nazienzen as calling them *those meetings of cranes and geese, that wage a cruel war against each other.*

The letter closes with an apology for having thus "embarked on the ecclesiastical ocean." Referring

to her chaplains, the Queen professes to have "trusted to the sincerity of her pilots." Yet, according to Toland, she was of herself competent to such discussion; for he declares, that "she had read every article in Bayle's Dictionary." Sophia Charlotte concludes with good wishes for Father Vota, and a hope, never realized, to see him again at Berlin, where she promises that he will "always find minds disposed for the search of truth."

Mr. L'Enfant appears to have been Sophia Charlotte's favourite chaplain. Observing that he had dedicated his *Histoire du Conseil de Constance* to her son Frederic William, who had just succeeded to the throne, in 1713, I was curious to observe if he had cherished the memory of his royal mistress on so fair an occasion. The dedication consists of the usual compliments to Protestant princes, but of Sophia Charlotte there is no recollection. She had been dead eight years; and courtiers, even court chaplains, understand that *a living dog is better than a dead lion.*

Messrs. L'Enfant and Beausobre have been long known to Biblical students, by their valuable Introduction to the Prussian Testament, an English translation of which has been reprinted by Bishop Watson in his Theol. Tracts. (iii. 101.)

#### VERMICULUS.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley.

SIR,

Among other facts which the learned prelate avers, "being supported by the authority of Ma-

sheim," he relates (Lett. vii. Sect. 5,) that the majority of Hebrew Christians, having divested themselves of the form of Judaism, which to that time they had borne, they removed from Pella, and other towns to which they had retired, and settled in great numbers at Ælia." Dr. Priestley, however, not having been able to discover any traces of this return from Pella, in all his researches into ecclesiastical antiquity, nor yet in Mosheim's General History of the Church, plainly taxes the bishop with being the inventor of this circumstance of the narrative. But the learned prelate conscious that in this particular he had not advanced a step beyond his great authority, Mosheim, indignantly repels the charge of his acute, but too precipitate, antagonist. "It happens," says the bishop, "that this fact, of which Dr. Priestley does me the honour to make me the inventor, is asserted by Epiphanius." Tracts, p. 416. And again, p. 417. "To this assertion of Epiphanius, Mosheim, relating the fact, refers. Relating the same fact, to Mosheim I referred: to the very passage where Dr. Priestley, had he known what it is to examine authorities, before he pronounces upon them, might have found the reference to the original author. The confidence with which he mentions this as a fact, forged by me, is only one instance out of a great number, of his own shameless intrepidity of assertion."

Passing over the wrathful expressions of the indignant writer, let us now attend to the passage in Epiphanius, which the right reverend prelate has cited at length, and which, for reasons sufficiently obvious, he has cited in

the original language, without a translation. The following is the purport of the passage. That Aquila, residing at Jerusalem, as overseer of Adrian's works, in the twelfth year of his reign, "saw the disciples of the apostles flourishing in the faith, and working great miracles of healing, and other wonderful things. For they had returned from Pella of the Decapolis, to Jerusalem, and were teaching. For when the city was about to be taken by the Romans, all the disciples were forewarned by an angel to withdraw from the city which was about to be utterly destroyed. These having withdrawn from Jerusalem resided in the aforesaid Pella, a city beyond the Jordan, but after the desolation of Jerusalem returning as I said, they performed great miracles." *Epiphanius, de Pond. et Meus. Sect. xv.*

Now Sir, it appears undeniably from this passage of Epiphanius, and still more from the context, that these holy men whom Aquila saw, who were returned from Pella, and who were preaching and working miracles at Jerusalem, in the twelfth year of Adrian, were the very same persons who, warned by an angel, had escaped from Jerusalem, previously to its desolation by Titus, forty-seven years before, according to Epiphanius's own calculation. Dr. Horsley adds, that they returned from Pella, "after the demolition of Jerusalem by Adrian:" and that "they made no scruple to renounce the Mosaic law, that they might be qualified to partake in the valuable privileges of the Ælian colony." Tracts p. 174. The canonized bishop of Salamis relates

who these returned emigrants were, and how they were employed, and the uncanonized bishop of St. Asaph states, with equal confidence, the chronology of their return, their renunciation of the Mosaic rites, to which they had been attached from their infancy, and the worthy motive, by which these primitive and orthodox brethren, were induced to this extraordinary conduct. And that which two bishops have affirmed, who will presume to dispute?

True it is, that the reviewer of this controversy, not having the fear of episcopacy before his eyes, and not sufficiently adverting to the gravity of the case, did amuse himself a little at the expence of these holy brethren, who at their advanced time of life, could be induced to shake off all their established and fondly cherished habits, and to take so fatiguing a journey, for no other purpose but to enjoy a few municipal privileges at Ælia: yet, learning from such high authority, that this was the object of their choice, he expressed his satisfaction at the information communicated by the veracious bishop of Salamis, "that these venerable members of the primitive church at Jerusalem, recovered from the fatigues of their march, and that, at the time when Aquila saw them, they were all flourishing in faith, teaching and working miracles in abundance."

This unhallowed remark upon these pious veterans, seems to have irritated the reverend prebendary's feelings beyond their usual point of ebullition. "Whether," says he, "Mr. B. was restrained by any *prudential motive* from making these observations on the reasoning of bishop Horsley, during that

prelate's life, is probably known to Mr. B. himself; but I will venture to assure him, that the bishop, were he now alive, and possessed of all his youthful ardour, would not deign to take the smallest notice of them. Even I, however inferior to him, will not condescend to make a serious reply to such a tissue of petulance and absurdity." Tracts. p. 587.

What the pious prebendary could possibly mean, by the expression, *prudential motive*,—whether he conceives that his right reverend father might be suspected of a disposition to lift either the spiritual or the secular arm against the impugners of his high authority, is, perhaps, *known to the worthy prebendary himself*: to Mr. B. it is utterly inconceivable: and the reverend gentleman may rest assured that Mr. B. was deterred by no consideration of that kind, at any time, from exposing the ludicrous absurdity of the bishop's hypothesis.

But it seems that the reverend prebendary will not, and he vouches that his learned parent, if he were living, would not *condescend* to reply to such a *tissue of petulance and absurdity*. The worthy prebendary's resolution is much to be approved, and the *prudence* of his motives cannot reasonably be doubted. But, though he will not reply, he will condescend to retort. And his success in irony bears a just ratio to his triumphs in argument.

As the foundation of his retort, the reverend gentleman rakes up a silly story of the English Unitarians having made some application to the ambassador of the emperor of Morocco, in the reign of Charles the Second. And he



further remarks, that the English Unitarians have published an Improved Version of the New Testament in the reign of George the Third. Hence he concludes, that upon the principles of the Reviewer of the Controversy, the Editors of the Improved Version must be the very same persons who applied to Ameth Ben Ameth, in the reign of Charles: and, consequently, that these venerable personages were no less than *one hundred and thirty-eight* years of age, when they accomplished their work of *correcting*, as he expresses it, the *oracles of God*.

Upon this ingenious parody the reverend prebendary expends much of his labour and his wit, and triumphs, not a little, in the happy conceit. It is much to be regretted, that its prolixity renders it inconvenient for transcribing. It may be found at page 588 of his new publication. And so well is the reverend gentleman satisfied with it, that he expects to receive the thanks of the reviewer for thus eking out his argument. In fact, there is only one circumstance wanting to render the parallel and the triumph complete; and that is, that some Unitarian bishop should be found, like the prelate of Salamis, to affirm, that the Unitarians who petitioned the Mahometan ambassador, in the reign of Charles the Second, were the very self-same individuals who taught religion, and worked miracles, and published Improved Versions, in the reign of George the Third. Till this event occurs, and till another saint, like St. Epiphanius, rises to illuminate the Unitarian church, let the worthy prebendary know, that his comparison halts in its main sup-

port: that his sarcasms are misplaced; and that it will be prudent for him to reserve his wit, I had almost said his buffoonery, to a more favourable opportunity, lest it should, unluckily, recoil upon himself.

Far different, but equally unsuccessful, was the learned prelate's mode of extricating himself from the fatal error of relating that upon the authority of Mosheim, which Mosheim related upon none." The instant he consulted the passage in Epiphanius, the bishop must have seen that it was nothing to his purpose; but what could he do? He had, most *intrepidly*, asserted the return of the orthodox Hebrew emigrants from Pella, renouncing the rites of the law: and when charged with inventing the story, he appealed to Mosheim, and Mosheim refers to Epiphanius. But the account of Epiphanius is too fabulous in itself, and too irrelevant to the subject to be relied upon for a moment. How then does this accomplished master of Aristotelian and Baconian logic grapple with this difficulty?

In the first place the bishop states it, point-blank, as Epiphanius's assertion, (Tracts, p. 416.) that "the Hebrew Christians, after Adrian's settlement of the Ælian colony, returned from Pella, whither they had retired from the distresses of the war, to Ælia." But to what war Epiphanius here alludes, the bishop leaves his readers to guess.

Secondly, The learned prelate, from *prudential motives* no doubt, sets down the whole of Epiphanius's testimony in the original Greek, that his readers might possess it, pure and unadulterated,

without note or comment. And though he refers to Epiphanius's work, he judiciously abstains from citing the chapter.

Thirdly, he states that it is "a matter of no importance," whether this return took place "at the end of Titus's or of Adrian's war; it is sufficient that these returned Christians were residing at Jerusalem, or, more properly, Ælia, at the same time that Aquila was residing there."—And, finally, he enters a very earnest caveat against chronological cavils.

All, however, would not do. His acute and indefatigable opponent pushes his advantage to the utmost; demonstrates the futility of Epiphanius's testimony, and compels the bishop, however reluctantly, to abandon these holy and orthodox emigrants to their fate. And when he proceeds, p. 419, to state the direct evidence "that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia," passing over, with very slight notice, the assertion of Epiphanius, which if at all worthy of credit would have been most applicable to his purpose, he chuses to derive his proof from Jerome, whose testimony the learned prelate "thinks more convincing than that of Epiphanius." The testimony of Jerome, as the reader may remember, is to this fact *alone*, that in his time there were certain "Hebrews, who believed in Christ." This forms the seventh and concluding step of the bishop's famous demonstration of the existence of the Hebrew orthodox church at Ælia. But if this flimsy testimony of Jerome was, in Bishop Horsley's estimation, *more*

convincing than that of Epiphanius, what must he have thought of Epiphanius's testimony?

In truth, the bishop himself, in his last publication, gives up the testimony of Jerome, as well as that of Epiphanius. His words, (Tracts p. 549) are remarkable.—"St. Jerome's evidence goes **BARELY** to the proof, that a body of orthodox Christians of the Hebrews was actually existing in the world much later than in the time of Adrian. St. Jerome's evidence is brought for the proof of this proposition **SINGLY**." And again, p. 551, "The existence of these orthodox Hebrew believers, in the time of St. Jerome, being thus proved by St. Jerome's evidence, the probability of the fact, that they resided at Ælia, and that such a body had been settled at Ælia from the time of Adrian downwards, **RESTS UPON MY SIX FORMER POSITIONS**." These six positions, the attentive reader will remember, were six gratuitous assumptions: and that they were not always judged by the bishop to be equal to the hard duty which he now imposes upon them, will appear from the learned prelate's own words, Tracts, p. 419. "It may seem that my six positions go no further than to account for the disuse of the Mosaic law, among the Christian's of Palestine, upon the *supposition* that the thing took place: and that they **AMOUNT NOT TO A PROOF** that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia. To complete the proof I might appeal to Epiphanius—but I will rather derive the proof from a fact which I think more convincing than the

testimony of Epiphanius. I will rest the credit of my seventh position upon the mention which occurs in St. Jerome's Commentary upon Isaiah, of Hebrews believing in Christ, as distinct from Nazarenes."

Thus, then, we are first informed that the six positions *not amounting* to a proof of the actual existence of this famous Hebrew church at Ælia, the testimony of Jerome is necessary to *complete the proof*. But we are now told "that the testimony of Jerome being alleged *barely and singly* to prove that a body of orthodox Hebrew believers existed in his own time, the probability of the fact, that such a body had been settled at Ælia from the time of Adrian downwards rests upon the six former positions." Had any one but that great master of dialectics, the Bishop of St. Asaph, made use of such reasoning as this, he would have been ridiculed for arguing in a circle. But, no doubt, had the learned prelate been living, he could have explained the consistency and established the validity of his own logic: a task which now devolves upon the reverend prebendary. In the mean time, readers who pretend to nothing more than common understanding, will naturally conclude, that if this *giant in controversy* may not, as the Quarterly Review asserts, be able to vanquish his mighty antagonist, he is fully competent to confute himself; and that the learned architect of the Hebrew orthodox church at Ælia, has completely demolished the foundations of his own favourite edifice.

I am, Sir, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

*Mr. Wright on Evangelical Preaching, in Reply to J. H.*

June 18, 1813.

SIR,

Your letter in the Repository for April last, (p. 249,) requires to be noticed by me. In the passage you have quoted from my Journal, it was not my intention to bring a charge against any minister, much less, as you have supposed, one that should be generally applicable; but simply to state what I understood to be a fact. So far from censuring the truly excellent persons, whose names you have mentioned, what I have seen of their works has afforded me pleasure and profit, and I highly respect their memory. As to the fact I stated, I believe I am far from being singular in thinking, that, till lately, "a dry, ethical mode of preaching" much prevailed. I agree with you, that it is not necessary ethical or moral preaching should be dry; but is it not likely to be so, if not associated with the facts, doctrines and motives of the gospel, which give life and force to every moral precept? I admit that doctrinal preaching may also be dry, "especially when it is interlarded with metaphysics," and its practical or moral application is not brought into view. But is it not possible so to unite doctrine and precept, in public discourses, that the doctrine shall enforce the precept, and the precept exhibit the moral use of the doctrine; and that these combined shall inform the judgment, warm the heart, and produce the best moral effects? Are there not proofs of the practicability of this in the valuable labours of many worthy ministers of the present day? You, Sir, will ad-



nit, that right views of Christian truth are of high importance; that they have a powerful bearing on moral improvement. But how are such views to be communicated to our hearers, unless we state and explain the facts and doctrines of the gospel? It is not by incidentally mentioning, nor by indirectly bringing into view, the doctrines of truth, that men will be convinced of error or led to true scriptural knowledge. Certainly, we should never attempt to build doctrines on detached texts, nor teach them as mere dogmas: yet, it may not be improper to refer to a number of texts, to shew what is the current language of scripture on a particular subject, provided the passages referred to be complete sentences, and neither figurative nor ambiguous. Though it appears to me most consistent and best calculated to do good for a minister fully to declare what he believes to be the truth of God, I am very far from taking upon me to say, which will be the best mode for him to adopt in his particular situation, to bring his hearers to the knowledge of it; yet surely it must be his duty to do all that he can to bring them to the knowledge of the truth. No doubt, "those ministers who preceded the present generation of Unitarians had judiciously and effectually prepared the way for them." They had done it by producing candour and Christian liberality in their congregations, and by teaching them that Christianity is a system of moral excellency. Some of them had done abundantly more: by their writings on theological subjects and labours in the field of controversy, they prepared the way

for what Unitarians are now doing. It is readily admitted they laboured, and we have entered into their labours. The question is not whether the mode of preaching formerly adopted by some of the worthy ministers who preceded the present generation of Unitarians, and which certainly in many instances produced good, was the most proper at that time; possibly, it was the only practicable plan they could adopt to effect any good in some situations: but whether it would be either proper and beneficial, or otherwise than injurious to the cause of truth, to continue it in the present day? Whatever might be the state of things and the mode of preaching adopted among our brethren in Lancashire and Cheshire formerly, I rejoice, and I believe you rejoice with me, that "Unitarianism is now preached among them as the doctrine of the gospel, and evangelical righteousness established on evangelical principles." With best wishes for the success of the labours of the ministers and the prosperity of the churches in the before-mentioned district, I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Yours, &c.  
R. WRIGHT.

---

*On Humility.*

SIR,

Having remarked how earnestly and repeatedly Jesus Christ points out to his disciples his own example of *humility*, and being well convinced that humility is a necessary foundation both of goodness and of happiness, I have attempted a short description of the valuable fruits which naturally spring from Christian humility: and shall be very glad, if you

think it worthy of being admitted into the Monthly Repository.

*The Fruits of Humility.*

The humble Christian is candid, gentle and patient; forbearing and forgiving; compassionate, kind and generous; sincere, grateful and obliging. He is submissive and resigned to the will of God; contented, cheerful and very happy. He is prepared to enjoy every blessing of kind Providence with the greatest advantage. He is safe in prosperity and full of comfort in adversity. Envyng none, he is delighted at seeing others happy. He lives peaceably with his neighbours, and is at peace with his own conscience. He is sure to obtain the favour and friendship of his heavenly Father. Daily and hourly he advances towards the possession of everlasting glory and perfect happiness.

J. C.

*Conversion of the Jews.*

SIR,

I have long ago wished to address a few lines to you in relation to the Jews, and on perusing this day some papers printed by the Society established in London for promoting the conversion of that people to Christianity, I have been induced to put that wish in execution. The motives of that society appear to me to be laudable, and, I doubt not, will be ultimately attended with some good effect, though I can by no means approve of all their measures, or of some of the sentiments they entertain, which seem to me not well calculated to answer the good purpose they have in view, that of bringing the ancient people of God to believe in him whom they once

pierced. However, upon the whole, I cannot help wishing them success and encouragement. The conversion of these once favoured people to the religion of the greatest and best of their prophets, will, I doubt not, be a great blessing to all other nations. What people so fit to be the missionaries of the Redeemer to all others upon earth, some of whom, if I mistake not, in some measure, understand every language under the sun? Who so fit as the Jews to be priests unto the God of Abraham?

But some Unitarians, amongst whom I may name the justly venerated Priestley, have led me to suppose, that, of all the schemes prevalent among Christians, the Unitarian is the least objectionable to the Jews. Whether this be the case, I have not been able to learn from converse with these people, except one, who, I am persuaded, thought it much more rational and more consistent with their scriptures than the Trinitarian. He was not a priest indeed, but an ingenious artist, of good sense and conduct.

But as some Jews have been converted to Christianity, I wish to know whether any of them are proper Unitarians? I conceive the question not an improper one, and that some of your correspondents may be able satisfactorily to answer it. If all that have been converted within a century be Trinitarians, and I think some of them are, I should be glad to know the reason, if any can be given. If none be given, I should almost suspect that we err in supposing the Unitarian doctrine the most acceptable to a Jew. Do the Jews themselves generally declare the



doctrine of the Trinity to be inconsistent with their scriptures? Or do they disregard all the doctrines supposed to be contained in the gospels, from prejudices of education, or for want of evidence, sufficiently convincing to their minds, of the divine mission of Jesus. The subject is, I think, worthy of discussion by some of your able correspondents, who may be more conversant with this peculiar people, their opinions and writings than I ever expect to be. Praying for the salvation of Israel, as a blessing to all the human race, the accomplishment of the divine promises, I am Sir,

Your's sincerely

J. I.

On Mr. Wright's Letter on Free Communion.

Kendal, May 18, 1813.

In your Repository (p. 252) I perceive a letter from Mr. Wright, in answer to Mr. Strephon's request. The sentiment of Mr. Wright appears to be, that if any members of a Christian church do verily deny the divine mission, miracles and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, the other members of that church have no right whatever to exclude them on that account from Christian communion. To me this does not seem to be scriptural. I shall, therefore, take notice of some of Mr. Wright's arguments, and briefly state what I consider the scriptures to teach on this subject, for the consideration of Mr. Wright, and our mutual readers.

One half of Mr. Wright's letter does not immediately bear on Mr. Strephon's question, but when he supposes the case to be real, he

then comes to the point, and asks, —“ Have we a right to withdraw from the Lord's table because they are there?”—To this he answers —“ if we believe it our duty to attend the Lord's table, we ought not to neglect it merely because some may attend there hypocritically; if we esteem it a privilege, should we neglect it because some may abuse it?” I would wish Mr. Wright to compare his reasoning here with the testimony of the apostle Paul:—2 Cor. vi. 14 —16. “ Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God: as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. *Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.*”

Mr. Wright asks another question, “ Ought we to expel them, if it be in our power?” To this he answers, “ We can have no right, authoritatively to exclude any from the Lord's table, for this clear reason, because *it is the Lord's*. Jesus is the only master, and has not delegated his authority to us.” To prove these assertions Mr. Wright refers us to the parable of the tares; and considers such characters “ as tares among the wheat,” and then observes, “ but we know who hath said, let both grow together, till the harvest.” Are Mr. Wright's reasoning and conclusions justified



by this parable? I think not. Our Lord has told us that the field is the *world*, not the church. (Math. xiii. 38.) The view of this parable, given by Mr. Wright, would prove too much, viz. that we ought not to put away any wicked person from a church of Christ. Mr. Wright, perhaps, was not aware of this; however, if this parable was designed to teach the propriety of a mixed communion of unbelievers with believers, this consequence cannot be avoided. And who does not see that this is plainly contradicted by Christ and his apostles. Math. xviii. 15—18. Read the whole 5th chap. of the 1 Cor. which concludes with this plain command,—“put away from among you that wicked person.” To understand the parable of the tares, it is necessary that we should consider, that in the kingdom of Israel the sword was to be used against idolaters, &c. (read Deut. xiii. 6—17) but now this is at an end. In the kingdom of Christ, God has given to none the power of punishing men for idolatry, unbelief, or false religion; and the design of this parable is to teach the disciples, that he permits of no persecution for religion, and to shew them the reason of his sparing wicked men in the world.

Mr. Wright admits that “it can be no breach of Christian charity, to declare that we do not acknowledge such to be Christian brethren.” But are we not acknowledging them to be Christian brethren, if we permit them to remain in a church of Christ? And if we bear this testimony concerning them, and still continue to observe the ordinances of Christ with them, are we not very inconsis-

tent?—Would it not be acting a wiser part, if, in obedience to the command of Christ, we faithfully told them of the error they were fallen into; and if we could not succeed in convincing them, then take one or two more with us; but if after this they remained impenitent, then tell it to the whole church; and if they refused to hear the church, then let them be disowned as Christian brethren; let them be regarded as heathens, as no longer the subjects of Christ, “for what part hath he that believeth with an unbeliever?” These are my views on this subject. It will be perceived they are very different from Mr. Wright’s; I shall leave it for your readers to judge on which side the truth appears.

Your’s, respectfully,  
WILLIAM JENNINGS.

#### Happy Puritan Quotation.

July 29, 1813.

*Oldmixon*, in his History of the Stuarts, (Fol. p. 21.) gives the following anecdote of a Puritan preaching before James the First, in 1604.

“Mr. Burgess, in his sermon, compared *ceremonies* to the Roman senator’s glasses, not worth a man’s life or livelihood. For, says he, “this senator invited *Augustus Caesar* to a dinner, who, as he was coming to the feast, heard a horrid outcry, and saw a company drawing a man after them, who made the noise. The emperor demanded the cause of that violence, and was answered—their master had condemned a man to the fishponds for breaking a glass which he set a high value and esteem upon. *Augustus* commanded a stay of the execution, and when he came into the house,

asked the senator whether he had glasses worth a man's life. Who replied, he had glasses valued at a province. 'Let me see them,' says the emperor. Accordingly he was brought into a room well furnished. The emperor allowed them to be beautiful to the eye; but, considering they might be the cause of much mischief, broke them all, saying, 'better all these perish than one man.' 'I leave,' says Mr. Burgess, 'to your Majesty to apply.' The bishops for this, and some other the like heinous crimes, got him silenced; but he was restored again to his ministry, and died in a good old age at Sutton Colefield in Warwickshire."

Calamy in his *Account* (p. 739) mentions Mr. Anthony Burgess, as ejected from the living of Sutton Colefield, in which he had succeeded Dr. John Burgess. This must have been the preacher before King James. The anecdote of Augustus I cannot find in Suetonius, nor am I aware from whence it was quoted. Your readers will recollect, that the Romans were accustomed to nourish their fish for the table with the carcases of their slaves. Nor was the practice confined to those convicted of crimes. It is recorded of *Cato the Censor*, that he thus disposed of his slaves when too old and infirm for labour. Such was heathen morality in one of its fairest forms.

SELECTOR.

Answer to "the Dissenting Minister's Complaint."

July 15, 1813.

MR. EDITOR,

The age in which we live is a complaining one; and whilst men of various descriptions are

giving vent to their discontents, it is nothing surprising that the dissenting minister should do so too. At the same time, what was held out to the public on this subject in your last Number, (p. 366,) ought to have been strictly conformable to truth: "nothing extenuated, nor ought set down in malice." Querulous and uncandid representations have a bad effect, not only upon the minds of such youth as have turned their thoughts towards the ministry, but also on the whole body of dissenting laity. Angry sneers at "rolling carriages," "quilted pews," and "daughters fashionably educated," are not the best means for bettering the worldly condition of a class of men for which it is easier to wish a better provision, than to procure it. I am one of those Sir, who have, during a tolerably long life endeavoured both by example and exhortation to promote so desirable a state of things; and I must say, for the honour of the Society of which I am a member, that, when properly called upon, it has never on any occasion, shrunk back from the duty of affording pecuniary assistance to its ministers or to their families: of this I could bring many striking instances. Your complaining correspondent, is well descended; his venerable ancestor, he says, "evinced the power of truth, and the low value at which worldly honours and profits are held by those who seek a kingdom which cannot be moved."—His views were glorious, and the sacrifice was noble; worthy of being imitated by his descendant; who, if he be not imbued with some portion of this spirit, has mistaken



his course of life. But I fear he has entered his profession with the same view of making a fortune in it, as the physician or the advocate, (whose gains he seems to envy) are wont to do; although uniform experience ought to have taught him, "that worldly honours and profits are not the reward of those who preach the kingdom of God."—In his sacred profession, men do not, nor ought they to enter the list with those who strive in the race where worldly riches is the prize. I most readily grant that a worthy and laborious Dissenting minister is deserving a larger stipend than he generally receives; yet I cannot admit it to be true that "our respectable congregations think they do enough for their minister if they raise a little more than 100*l.* per ann.;" and that stipends have lowered, is so far from being the fact (except in very declining congregations) that in most places, I believe, they have been raised. The description which this gentleman gives of his own situation, certainly calls for commiseration; but let him look at those from whom his salary, whatever it may be, is collected; are not many of them so bowed down with the expences of the days in which we live, and with the loss of trade, as scarcely to be able to spare from the wants of their own families, that portion which they give to their minister? and has he not witnessed the ruin and bankruptcy of others whom he once looked upon as his opulent friends? Your correspondent bids us "consider the actual price of the necessities of life;" a proper consideration no doubt; but let him also reflect that these necessities are not dear to him, and cheap to his flock. The discontented mind of this divine, has, I am sorry to say it, given an angry, sarcastic, and uncandid turn to his animadversions; why else should he represent congregations as "*being desirous* of keeping their minister in honourable poverty?" or why should he retail the pretended "illiberal and base insinuations" of those who are said to have declared "that they pay enough,"—and that "their ministers are as well off as others of the community?" or disgust us with anecdotes of individual meanness?—This gentleman has thought proper, on the other hand, to suppress the whole of what might reflect any honour upon the body of dissenting laity, or tend to rescue it from the charge of meanness or illiberality: nothing is said of those calls which are constantly made upon the wealthy for the support of institutions established by them for the education of youth; nor of such as contemplate giving assistance to declining age, or to the orphan families of Dissenting ministers; nor of those casual subscriptions which are frequently occurring, for some object connected with the relief or comfort of those who minister in spiritual things. By way of justifying his complaints and heightening them by the contrast, this gentleman bids us "look at the Church."—We do so; and what do we see in the church? More complaints and more real poverty and distress, amidst all its wealth, than this dissatisfied divine seems to have any idea of. In the debate of last week, on the Curate's Bill, Mr. Rose asserted that there were a thousand Cura-



cies of less than £50, and 1642 of less than £80 per annum : besides 2104 incumbents at less than £100. This is not stated by me to shew that our ministers "are very well off," but to prove the absurdity of this way of reasoning : besides, the dissenting is not so sterile a soil as some may imagine ; we have rich physicians, bankers, advocates and merchants, and these are among the sons of the prophets. One cause of this gentleman's complaint, is that in order to support a family he is under the necessity of labouring in some auxiliary way ; what his labours might have been had he been thrown into some other walk of life, I cannot say ; but this I will take upon me to affirm without fear of denial, that no set of men brought up to the common occupations or professions, can, or do give up so much time to relaxation and pleasure as our young divines are in the habit of doing. The gospel is certainly "a pearl of great price," but its value does not depend, as this gentleman seems to think it does, upon the money we pay for it ; though I am far from denying that those who *serve* at the altar ought to *live* by it. With respect to the decline of that good old custom of sending tokens of regard for our ministers in the shape of viands, I could point out a way of accounting for that, which would rescue the laity from the charge of meanness, but I chuse to be silent on this head ; wishing to say nothing that might offend ; at the same time that justice demanded that some notice should be taken of the misrepresentations of a discontented man who has thought fit to make his own case, the case of every Dissenting minister.

VERAX.

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

*Primitivus in Answer to Mr. Jones. (See pp. 392—466—521.)*

SIR,

Allow me now to resume my observations on Mr. Jones's letter on Acts xx. 28.

The support given by the Æthiopic version to the received text, *του θεου*, remains without any confirmation from Mr. Jones. This is evident from his relying on the *Latin translation* of that V. in Walton's Polyglott, which I will immediately shew to be undeserving of that reliance. First, because, in the opinion of Michaelis, a good judge, as I will take for granted, and your read-

ers will allow, that Latin translation has little merit. My small study furnishes me with but few books, which obliges me to make the best use I can of those which I possess. The work of Michaelis, which pronounces on the merit of the translation in question, is not among my small number ; but the report of Dr. Middleton, who could have no motive to sacrifice his reputation, by a false account, is of sufficient authority to prove the Professor's opinion. The passage to which I particularly refer is in p. 460 of "Greek Article," which, however, is not the only one that would serve my purpose

His words are, "Mr. Wakefield every where professes his high opinion of this version, (the Æthiopic) but I do not recollect that he has any where informed us on what ground his esteem is founded; whether on the merits of the version itself, of which, according to Michaelis, we know less than of any other Oriental Version: but which, as far as respects the Epistles, he says, was made by a person who was very inadequate to the task; or merely on the Latin, which, according to the same critic, is of little value." I rely on this account as a faithful report of Michaelis's opinion, which will be deemed sufficient to establish my position, at least in default of better evidence, that the Latin translation of the Æ. V. has little merit. If Dr. Middleton has misled his readers, he must answer for himself.

But, secondly, the Latin translation, whatever may be its general value, is of no weight as to the text from which the Æ. V. was made, because, if the word be one which stands, in that V. for θεος and for κυριος indiscriminately, as asserted by Griesbach, it would naturally be rendered into Latin by *Deus* or *Dominus* indifferently, according to the determination of the translator. Griesbach's assertion, therefore, is not at all impugned by Mr. Jones's Latin from the Polyglott, nor is Mr. Wakefield's *gentle* censure of him in the least confirmed. Indeed, whatever the term in the Æ. V. may be, the translator may be supposed to have had his innocent prejudices, so, at least, as to translate an *ambiguous* word favourably, if possible, to his own creed, if he might not also have

thought it justifiable even to render a *plain* one, that should militate against that creed, by one more favourable to it, especially if that should have the support, as in this case, of the common Greek and of the Vulgate Version. Mr. W. and G. therefore, stand as they did, for any thing that Mr. Jones has asserted, for his proof entirely fails. For my own part, I freely own myself disposed to believe Griesbach; as I have no proof of Mr. W's. superiority over him on this point, and think it far more candid, however Mr. J. may question my "candor," to suppose that Mr. W's. *passion*, which is apparent from his language, led him into error, though I still suspect his *knowledge*, than to admit that G. has asserted a deliberate or infamous falsehood, as he is accused of doing by Mr. W. and his defender. However, I really wish that the point, though of small importance indeed to Acts xx. 28, were finally decided by some oriental scholar of established authority, which has not been done, as far as I know, although orthodoxy would scarcely have slumbered if the assertion of Mr. W. had been capable of proof. I fear that it has been all the while indulging a laugh in the sleeve at the aid lent to it by granting it the reading του Θεου, while it turned up its nose, in scorn, at the attempt to enfeeble that aid by the curious rendering of, *his own son*.

Mr. J. joins the Arabic version with the Æthiopic as bearing the same testimony. But, on enquiry, he will find this to be a mistake, for the reading which that V. would countenance is του κυριου Θεου, an expression not



to be found in any Greek writer.

Before the conclusion of his second paragraph, which is the first of his attack on Griesbach, Mr. J. has granted to that critic all that he could wish, and totally given up the defence of Mr. W. He says, "the Æthiopic translator associated with θεός the same awful or even superstitious idea which the Septuagint had done with the term Jehovah; (is this perfectly correct as to the LXX?) he therefore seems to render θεός by (a word equivalent to) κύριος wherever it occurs, and by that word when used absolutely or unrestricted he ever means the Supreme Being." Was this the case, in sooth? I have no business with what *he meant* by (the word equivalent to) κύριος, here, or in as many places as Mr. J. chooses. What has Griesbach said more, who had to settle his text, let the meaning be what it might? Is it, then, granted that the translator's rendering is the same as would do for the Greek word κύριος? Whence is it then concluded that his text, whether Greek or not Greek is not yet determined, contained the reading θεός? This *supposition* of Mr. J., for he will scarcely contend that it is any thing more, does his cause no service, and he might well have spared his inference, that "Mr. W. knew this, and he asserts it," (he asserts, by the by, no such thing) "though the assertion, it must be allowed, is weakened by the appeal which he makes to his own recollection." Had Mr. Wakefield thus thought or asserted, he never would have so harshly charged infamous falsehood on Griesbach, whose position is thus undesignedly established,

though with qualifications, which, however, answer no purpose; for "absolutely" and "unrestricted" are mere sounding words employed to serve an occasion, and the reading of the Æ. V. is not altered by them.

Mr. J. next argues that as *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου* is no where used in the N. T. therefore it cannot be the reading of this text. This is some presumption, I allow, against it, but the inference is not irrefragable. If the reading be established by good proof, its being *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον* would not exclude it. Although *ἡ δόξα θεοῦ* and *ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ* are often to be found in the N. T., *ἡ δόξα κυρίου* is read *but once*, and in that instance there are various readings; yet without disturbing the expression. However this may be, the next sentence falls harmless out of the writer's hands, and must be attributed to an oversight little to be expected from Mr. Jones's sagacity. It is, in substance, that, if the reading *τοῦ κυρίου* were admitted, it would not mean Christ but God; "because *ὁ κύριος*, when used in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, unrestricted by some other word or circumstances in the context, ever denotes the Supreme Being." On this I observe, first, that it would seem hence that Mr. J. thinks *ὁ κύριος* to be an appellation of the Supreme Being frequently occurring, and one peculiarly appropriated to God and exclusive generally of all others. Than this nothing can be less founded. Michaelis seems to have doubted whether God, or the Father, is ever in the N. T. called *ὁ κύριος*, and Dr. Middleton corrects him by a scanty collection of texts.



Had Mr. J's observation been either unacquainted with Greek, predicated of *κύριος* instead of *ὁ* or destitute of judgment." For, *κύριος*, it would have been generally and fundamentally true. The state of the case is nearly this, though I know that I am treading on tender ground, of which Mr. J. was not aware when he wrote as above: God, both in the Seventy and in the N. T. is generally styled *κύριος* when no other word is added, and not very often *ὁ κύριος*. In the Seventy *κύριος* is appropriated to God, and used of no other absolutely. The same may be said of the N. T. generally, the absence of the article, in other applications of it, being easily accounted for, on good principles. This being the case, it was of importance to Bishop Pearson, towards proving the divinity of Christ, to shew that he also is called *κύριος*, very unlike Mr. Jones who seems to think that *ὁ κύριος* is more sacredly applied to the Almighty. The Bishop has produced about a hundred passages to make good his point, not one of which will serve his purpose. The most plausible is *ἡμερὰ κυρίου*, which may not mean particularly the *day of Christ*. Dr. Middleton, pp. 294, 295, has attempted to furnish more decided examples, without success. But, secondly, as to the application of *ὁ κύριος*, or *κύριος*, to none but the Supreme Being without some word or circumstance to restrain them, no one can hesitate to allow the position. The observation, however, does not help out Mr. J's conclusion, that Griesbach has, by adopting *τοῦ κυρίου* in his text, "introduced a change of words, without any change whatever in the meaning, which shews him,

if we adopt *τοῦ κυρίου*, have we not the very condition which he requires, "words or circumstances in the context," which as effectually restrict the expression to Christ as any passage in the whole N. T.? The disciples said to the two that had been at Emmaus, *The Lord, ὁ κύριος, hath risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon?* The words *hath risen* and *appeared* point out Jesus as the person intended. But are not the words in the text under consideration, viz. *which he hath purchased with his own blood*, as strongly restrictive? For I pronounce it as impossible for the Supreme Being to have *shed his blood*, as it was for him, after shedding his blood, to have *risen* and *appeared*. Although Mr. J. deserves to be reprehended for his insinuation that Griesbach was, for adopting *τοῦ κυρίου*, "either unacquainted," &c. I will not retort. It is enough to shew that G's. Greek and his judgment stand unjustly impeached, because the attack upon him is altogether founded in error.

On the whole, I see no reason to doubt the ground by which Griesbach's reading is supported. Mr. J. however, although he appears unsuccessful, in his defence of Mr. Wakefield and in his attack on Griesbach, which is the proper design of his paper, must be allowed the praise of ingenuity and originality, in the interpretation of the latter part of the verse, if the reading *τοῦ θεοῦ* should prove to be genuine, which I confess is far from appearing to me to be the case. Mr. J. is the friend to whom I referred, at the conclusion of the paper signed Primiti-

vas. But as I then did not rightly apprehend his solution, the whole of that passage should be cancelled. Having mentioned this, I beg leave to observe, that in that paper several other errors appear, which may be attributed to my haste and bad writing. Grammatical faults need not to be noticed, as your readers will probably impute them to the true cause. The parenthesis, however, respecting these languages, is so totally wrong, that it should be erased. Other blemishes must remain. But to conclude.

An objection or two seem to militate against Mr. J.'s novel and ingenious interpretation of the latter part of our text, where he supposes that the person who purchased the church of God is not God, but *he*, that is, Jesus Christ, *he* emphatically. First, I doubt whether emphasis can be inferred, where no nominative case is employed, except where there is no other resource. Prophetic language is reserved, so that the reference to the LXX, Micah vi. 2, seems insufficient. The saying of the disciples of Pythagoras, *αυτος εφα*, referring to himself without further description, has the nominative expressed, which is the thing I want, and confirms my objection. 2dly. The rule, "a clause introduced to define the object, cannot be separated from it and changed, to become the agent of the same verb," is worded obscurely, and the drift of it seems to be contradicted by other passages, unless the cautious fence drawn round it renders it secure. Fearing to appear prompt to object to every thing, and wanting leisure and inclination for the search, I have not looked designedly for phrases

which may contravene this canon. But I would offer the following passages out of the LXX to Mr. J.'s attention, to which others might be added. Josh. xxiv. 31, *παντα τα εργα κυριου οσα εποισε*. 1 Kings xv. 29, *το ρημα κυριου ο ελαλησε*. 2 Kings xviii. 16, *τας εντολας αυτου οσας ενετειλατο*. Jerem. xxxvi. 4, *παντας τους λογους κυριου ους ελαλησε*. 3dly. The novelty of Mr. J.'s interpretation seems to be a strong argument against it. How came it, if, as he seems to say, the ancients were embarrassed respecting *the blood of God*, and therefore substituted *κυριου* for *θεου*, that *they*, who knew Greek usage in no mean degree, never stumbled on this solution, which would have served them quite as well as corrupting the text? I fear they did not apprehend that the passage would admit it. In so long a lapse of ages, one would have expected that this canon of criticism, or, at least, that ingenuity and embarrassment, would have come to their relief, if there had been room for them. Surely, however, their bias was strongly, not against, but for, *του θεου*; and I can account, on no other supposition, for the reading, *του κυριου και θεου*, found in so many manuscripts, which decidedly is not the true reading, as the manuscripts are of little value which Mr. J. has not noticed. Had *θεου* been already in the text, what need was there of *κυριου* before it, which clearly increases the supposed difficulty, as the words so united are more decidedly the appellation of the Supreme Being. On the contrary, orthodox zeal would naturally add *θεου* to *κυριου*, as this would unequivocally prove the divinity of Christ



to persons knowing nothing of Mr. J.'s rule and interpretation. The first degree of daring would naturally be a small *addition*, not speedily to be detected. The next would be the rejection of the original reading, *του κυριου*, entirely, that the possible reference of *his own blood*, to that expression might be precluded, and that its necessary application to *του θεου*, now standing alone, might triumphantly establish the divinity of Christ, of whom, exclusively, *shedding his own blood* could, it was with good reason thought, be predicated. Lastly, I dare not yet trust to this new interpretation, as a secure defence against the impiety which Mr. Wakefield so justly dreaded. Give the learned or the unlearned the reading *του θεου*, *of God*, and they will not scruple to shed his blood, if by that means they can establish the divinity of Christ. Canons and rules will prove a weak barrier against the inundation of mystery and blasphemy that will ensue.

The truth, however, is the truth. If the new interpretation can be confirmed, I shall have no unwillingness to read, the church

*of God*, if that reading can be established also. But no consideration can induce me to believe, that God, whether a first or second person is of little consequence, *shed his blood*, or that this text teaches that God purchased a church by *his own Son*. I like Mr. Jones's conjecture as a *dernier resort*. At present, it seems unnecessary and not founded. Griesbach's reading yet maintains its ground, and answers every purpose of defence against impiety. The appearance of a faithful translation of his note in your Repository would be highly acceptable and extensively useful.

Your readers will pardon this obtrusion on their attention, though at such great length. They will, however, be glad to be now released, as I am in bearing my humble testimony to your excellent and liberal publication, into which alone any thing like free discussion of religious subjects, any thing in the shape of theological and biblical criticism, is admitted in this enlightened country and extensive empire. Go on and prosper.

CHARLES LLOYD.

## REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *Essays on the Language of Scripture; with Additions and Corrections.\* In Two Volumes. By John Simpson.† Printed*

*by Cruttwell, Bath. Sold in London, by Egerton and by*

\* All or most of these Essays were at first printed, successively and separately, for circulation among the author's friends.

† In the interval between the transmission and the appearance of this arti-

cle, the excellent writer of the *Essays, &c.* which are the subject of it, has finished his mortal course. We knew, admired and esteemed, and shall long lament him. It was our hope, we confess, that our notice of this his last valuable publication, might meet his eye, and, on the whole, obtain his approbation. We were persuaded that he would



Johnson and Co. 1812. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 496. Vol. II. pp. 380.

There are two methods of reading and interpreting scripture,—the popular and the critical; or, as we may describe them, in rather different language, the superficial and the deliberative. The meaning of the sacred writings is commonly judged of by their sound, and by certain early associations of ideas, the correctness of which it is deemed criminal for the possessor of them to doubt or even to investigate. On the other hand, reflecting men compare words with words, phrases with phrases, passages with passages: they pay diligent attention to the circumstances of the authors, to the usages of the countries in which they lived, to their known characters, to their professed design; and, by the aid of this process, the volume of revelation explains itself, for the most part, naturally, easily and consistently. The difference between these modes of expounding the scriptures, is much the same with what obtains be-

tween a vulgar and a just philosophy in physics. Ignorant and careless observers, men who cannot or will not exercise patient thought, pronounce concerning the solar system from impressions made upon their senses. They reason, (if indeed they can with any propriety be said to *reason*,) from present and *mere* appearances. Seeing the sun rise every day in the east and set as regularly in the west, they conclude that it performs a diurnal revolution in the heavens: and, in like manner, they imagine that the moon, the planets and the stars serve no other purposes than those of adorning the firmament and relieving, in some measure, the darkness of the night. To gain even tolerably correct conceptions of the grandeur and simplicity of that portion of creation to which our earth belongs, and still more of the universe, requires the improvement of our time and an effort of the mind. With this view, the prejudices of the infant and the child, the tales of the nursery, if not of the parlour, must be forgotten and dismissed: one phenomenon must be surveyed in relation to another, and the illusions of sense be rectified by the dictates of the judgment. No man, who ventures to account for the appearances of nature without the help of science, has the slightest pretensions to the name of a philosopher: nor is any one worthy of being listened to in the character of an expositor of the Bible, whether from the pulpit or the press, who interprets it on principles contradictory to those which we have been stating. Since the days of Locke, (and perhaps we cannot find a merely human writer

not be offended, if we sometimes dissent from his reasonings and conclusions: we trusted that at least he would not condemn the spirit of our remarks: and we looked forward to the possibility, if not the probability, of being favoured, in the pages of the *Monthly Repository*, with communications on a few points of scriptural criticism from this amiable, candid and learned person. Our expectations are awfully disappointed. We mourn, in common with numbers, the loss of a bright ornament of the Christian cause. But we have not judged it necessary or expedient to suppress this part of our Review, which perhaps will attract attention in consequence of the peculiar and very painful circumstances under which it is submitted to our readers.

to whom the cause of intellectual, political and religious truth is more substantially indebted,) an opinion has gained ground among critics and divines, that scripture is the best and only legitimate expounder of scripture. Though the number of those who receive and illustrate this sentiment is extremely small, when contrasted with the multitude of persons who never think about it or by whom it is practically denied, yet we do not recollect that the proposition itself has been called in question: and even were it opposed, as we know that it is disregarded, the opposition would not be more respectable, or ultimately more successful, than what has been given to the philosophy of Newton; it would not be more deserving the notice of real scholars. The single distinction, and assuredly a very important one, between the cases, is this: errors as to the philosophy of the universe are far less injurious than the application of false criticism to the scriptures. From the works of Voltaire, Gibbon and some other unbelievers, we learn that infidelity does not scruple to avail itself of current and mistaken interpretations of passages in the Bible, in order to arraign with more plausibility the evidences of revelation. Not less notorious is it, that men have attempted to support Anti-Christian doctrines by the habit of detaching texts from whatever precedes and follows, and then citing them as irrefragable proofs of some favourite tenet. Our Saviour's words, Matt. iv. 7, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," have been gravely urged as a demonstration of his own essential deity; and the same article of faith has been erected on

1 John v. 20, "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." Upon points of conduct, too, unwarrantable principles of sacred criticism have exercised an influence. Sometimes a highly figurative, sometimes a rigorously literal, exposition of the scriptures, has given birth to practices which, it is generally agreed, no fair explanation of these writings can sustain, and even to acts which the precepts and the spirit of them are understood by most persons to condemn.

Such being the evils that flow from the wrong criticism of scripture, and such, by consequence, the value of solid principles of interpretation in reference to this volume, we must acknowledge the obligations which, in common with all consistent friends of the Bible, we owe to the author of these *Essays, &c.* for his very meritorious labours. Few men are better qualified for such researches. Having, in early life, enjoyed signal advantages, which he well improved, for appreciating the moment and drawing from the sources of scriptural criticism,\* he has happily possessed sufficient leisure for prosecuting his inquiries into the records of revelation, together with a fortune and a spirit which have both prompted and enabled him to lay the result of those inquiries before the public in the most disinterested manner. An excellent little tract, which he printed a few years since, on the *Impropriety of the usual Method of teaching Theology*, and in which he admirably shews that Protestants should take their views of

\* *Mon. Repos.* Vol. viii. 166, 229.



divine doctrines immediately from the Bible, might not improperly have been prefixed to the present work. Nor is this tract the only specimen of Mr. Simpson's eminent fitness for the employment in which we now find him engaged. His Essay to evince that Christianity is best conveyed in the historical form, and his treatises on the excellence and internal evidences of this religion, testify that he is a theologian of no ordinary distinction, that, while he is largely acquainted with books, he is indebted, still more, to his own patient, reflecting, candid, impartial mind, that he is diligent in the investigation, intrepid, yet unobtrusive, in the avowal of what he conceives to be the will of God, that he is an accurate thinker and reasoner, a perspicuous and often an elegant writer.

These volumes are the fruits of time, of care and deliberation. Our account of them will be as concise as justice to the author and our readers may admit: where we are particularly gratified by his skill and judgment, and where we see cause of differing from him, we shall stop either to express our approbation or to state the reasons of our dissent; and, at the conclusion of the article, we shall subjoin a few remarks on the classification of texts in general, and on the mode of classing them adopted by Mr. Simpson.

A short preface announces the design of the Essays, declares that increased "veneration for and attachment to the Bible" which the writer feels, as effects of these inquiries, and brings forward some respectable opinions and authorities in favour of a thorough and unbiassed search into the true

meaning of scripture, together with passages in the New Testament itself that are decisive to this purpose.

The first Essay is on the duration of a future state of punishments and rewards. By way of introduction to it, the author lays down rules of interpretation, the justness of which we are neither able nor disposed to controvert: to none of them, we presume, can a sound scriptural critic, be he of what communion he may, reasonably demur.

This Essay has two general divisions: in the former, those expressions are considered which relate to the duration of the future punishment of the wicked; in the latter, those which relate to the duration of the future happiness of the righteous. Agreeably to the arrangement thus made, Mr. Simpson begins with producing ten texts, (Heb. vi. 2. should perhaps be added,) which he believes to be all the instances wherein the words *αιων* and *αιωνιος* are applied in the New Testament to the duration of future punishment: and, in order to ascertain the exact meaning of these words, he previously inquires how they are used respecting other subjects in the New Testament and in the LXX translation of the Old.

Eighteen examples are, accordingly, given of the application of *αιων* to present time, *this life* or *age* or *world*. We shall pause for a moment, to observe that, on an examination of this set of texts, we find them strictly pertinent to the purpose for which they are introduced, and that 1 Cor. viii. 13. "I will not eat flesh" *εις τον αιωνα*, "*for ever*," or *during my whole life*, seems a most unequivocal

proof of *αιων* being sometimes employed simply in regard to the present stage of man's existence. Our translators have here thought proper to refrain from a perfectly literal rendering,\* and, by not following their usual course, have prevented most of their readers from seeing that the phrase *for ever* does not always import *infinite duration*. Wakefield and Newcome, on the contrary, have been faithful to the original.

In ten passages of the Christian scriptures, *αιων* and *αιωνιος* stand for *past* limited duration, of different periods. We may remark that there are many such instances in the LXX. Mr. S. has further collected twenty-two from the sacred volume throughout, in which these words are applied to *future* limited duration. He rightly interprets Heb. vi. 5. of the Christian system.

Our author finds that in eleven texts, taken exclusively from the New Testament, these same expressions signify duration *without end*. However, in this series of passages, most of those where *αιων* occurs have a repetition of the word, v. g. *της αιωνας των αιωνων*. In seven places, the terms bear the meaning of duration *without beginning and without end*.

We fully subscribe to the following deduction of Mr. Simpson's, (p. 17.)

"It appears from the different senses of the adjective *αιωνιος*, and from the much more frequent application of *αιων* the substantive, to denote a limited, than an eternal duration, that no

conclusion can be fairly drawn *merely* from the use of these words for the absolute eternity either of the punishment of the wicked or of the happiness of the righteous."

In page 18 he has introduced a consideration which, however valid in itself, may by some persons be deemed foreign to an Essay on the language of Scripture, &c. There are those who, if they do not deny that the doctrine of the strict eternity of future punishments, "mitigates against all *their* ideas of the infinite mercy and goodness of God," will yet remind Mr. S. that the present inquiry is, whether this tenet be inculcated in the sacred writings?

The next section is devoted to an examination of the scriptural sense of the words *απολλυμι* and *απωλεια*.

To *kill*, or *destroy temporally*, and to *die*, is stated to be the most frequent meaning of *απολλυμι* in the New Testament. About thirty-six examples of this signification of it are brought together by our author; eight, where it is put for to *lose life*, *this life*, *the life after this*; eleven, where it stands for *losing any thing*; and eight, where it expresses *going astray*. But the last sense is obviously the same with that of being *lost for a time*.

This verb has also various other meanings, such as to *punish*, to *make foolish* or *impotent*, to *induce to offend* or *act contrary to conscience*, &c. Nine cases are adduced of its application to the future life.

For the present, at least, we shall do no more than quote Mr. Simpson's declaration in respect of the opinion that future punishment will consist in annihilation: he says, p. 29,

\* They have committed the same offence against correctness in 1 Sam. iii. 35. "He shall walk before mine anointed *for ever*:" literally and better, *all his days*.



"In the New Testament, I believe, no instance occurs, in which ἀπολλυμι or [and] ἀπωλεια necessarily require to be understood of eternal death or annihilation, when they are applied to the future punishment of the wicked."

Απωλεια, in the twenty passages where we meet with it, has four leading significations: in seven places, it means *death* or *temporal destruction*; in two, *waste*, *profusion*; in four, *injury*, *hurt*, *calamity*; and in the rest it is applied to the *future life*.

Ολεθρος is found in only four passages of the Christian Scriptures. In 1 Cor. v. 5.\* it denotes some kind of *mortification* or *pain*, in 1 Tim. vi. 9, *punishment*, *present* or *future*, or *both*, in 1 Thess. v. 3, *impending calamity*, in 2 Thess. i. 9, *the highest degree of future punishment*, in whatever it consist.

Those texts in the New Testament of which the word πυρ makes part, are next placed before our eyes. To the enumeration of them many good observations of the writer's are annexed. He appears to coincide so far with the advocates of what has been styled *the annihilation scheme* as to understand the metaphors in these passages not only of grievous suffering, but, moreover, of destruction by death; "the wicked," he adds, "are described as dying again after severe punishment, in the world to come." 46.

The origin and meaning of the term γεεννα are distinctly pointed out by this author: it seems more expressive of the severity than of the duration of future punishments; at any rate, it does not represent their absolute eternity. From an

induction of passages Mr. S. concludes, likewise, that the word Αδης "has no relation to vice or virtue, reward or punishment, but signifies merely the state of the dead in general." 51.

He next investigates the sense of the words αποθνησχω, θανατος, δευτερος θανατος. It is his judgment that "death does not convey the idea of an eternal suspension [loss] of life, or of total extinction of being." The second death, he tells us, "consists in Death himself and hades, or the state of the dead, and all who are not written in the book of life, being cast into the lake of fire; which is figuratively saying that they shall be *abolished*, or that there shall be an end put to death, to the state of the dead, and to there being any who are not written in the book of life" (53). But how does this view of the matter accord with Rev. ii. 11.?—with the assurance, "He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the second death!" In Mr. S's. opinion, the second death is an event most animating and glorious: agreeably to the Saviour's promise, recorded in the Apocalypse, it is a catastrophe singularly injurious and afflictive! We think that in Rev. xx. 14\* the words *the second death* are synonymous with *the lake of fire*. If the respectable author of these Essays, will turn to the passage in Griesbach's last edition, he will perceive that some words are added† to the verse, which give the whole clause the appearance

\* Let this text be compared with Rev. xx. 6. and 1 Thess. iv. 16.

† The addition, undoubtedly, is suspicious: yet its existence serves to shew the light in which the phrase *the second death* was viewed.

of being a gloss; an inference the more probable, as the text of this book is still very far from having been restored to purity.

Φθίρω in 1 Cor. iii. 17, seems to describe punishment indefinitely, without any relation to future punishment in particular: and this remark may be extended to its derivative φθора. The strict meaning of *κολασις* is corrective punishment. It is observable that we meet with the substantive but twice in the gospels and epistles. How far a word of such infrequent occurrence, will warrant the conclusion sometimes deduced from it, may admit of doubt.

The eleventh section contains arguments to shew that future punishment will reform the wicked, and fit them for pure and spiritual happiness. Of these arguments some are scriptural: but some are derived from other sources—from analogies in the divine government and from the natural suggestions of the human heart. Nor do we look upon Mr. Simpson's quotations from the New Testament as being uniformly pertinent. We allow indeed that Rom. v. 15, &c. is highly deserving of regard. The stress however placed by the writer, on such phrases as *I will draw all men* unto me, *reconcile all things* to himself, the Saviour of *all men*, the sins of *the whole world*, &c. is perhaps excessive. These and similar passages we expound not of all men *literally* and *individually*, but of the universality of the Christian dispensation, of the equal communication of its blessings to *the two great divisions of mankind*, of the union of believing Jews and believing Gentiles in the church of Christ.

The following observations are forcible and important, (p. 67):

"Had Jesus or his apostles designed to have represented the duration of future punishment by terms that signified extinction of being after a certain period of misery, or never ceasing torment, they might easily have done either of these. Τιμωρία is used for the greatest punishment; Heb. x. 29; and αἰδιος, for proper eternity; Rom. i. 20; Wisdom vii. 26. By these words, which are stronger than any that are applied to future punishment in the New Testament, Josephus has expressed the idea which the Pharisees entertained of the never ceasing torments of the wicked. De Bello Judaico, lib. ii. cap. viii. sec. 14, p. 1065, ed. Hudson."

In pp. 68, 69, our author, from his foregoing enumeration of texts, forms inferences decidedly in favour of the doctrine of final universal restoration to virtue and happiness. His twelfth section contains objections and replies. In this part of his undertaking his judgment and ability are not least conspicuous; we should gladly make some extracts from it, did not our limits constrain us to refer our readers to the work itself.

Under the second chapter, containing thirteen sections, an enumeration is made of Greek terms employed by the writers of the New Testament to describe the duration of the future happiness of the righteous. In two passages *διήνεκες* is used of limited, in two, of unlimited, existence. Concerning this and every similar word, in its application to the present subject, one remark may be made: The life of virtuous men in the world to come, is always spoken of, by Jesus and his apostles, as *everlasting*. It is declared to be such in so many places and in so great a variety of



phrase that we cannot reasonably doubt whether the expression should be taken in its absolute and literal meaning. But whenever this or any corresponding epithet is applied to a topic with which it is seldom joined, probably, it should then be understood in a more qualified sense, and interpreted agreeably to its connection and the general tenor of revelation.

We should be unjust to Mr. Simpson were we not to transcribe his two concluding paragraphs: 91, 92.

"If there be joy over *one* sinner who repenteth, (Luke xv. 7. Matt. xviii. 13.) what an inconceivable multiplication of this joy must there be, at the restoration of millions of mankind from the death of sin to a life of undefiled and unceasing enjoyment? Can any one who sympathises with the state of every human being, refrain from rejoicing at the prospect of such a wide diffusion of felicity? The more he has dreaded the extension of misery to the unspeakable numbers who leave this world unfitted for the relish of pure and virtuous pleasures, the more gladly will he contemplate that awful, grand and animating scene, when Jesus, having accomplished the extensively benevolent purposes of his divine commission, shall deliver up his kingdom and power to the Father, who then will be all in all. The perfection of his power, wisdom and goodness, in his general government of the world, and in the formation and completion, by his honoured missionaries, of the great scheme for the final everlasting salvation and happiness of his whole family on earth, will then be clearly displayed, and be gratefully acknowledged by all. And the myriads of his rational creatures that have succeeded each other since the first formation of the world, being all restored to purity and happiness, will rejoice to promote the unalloyed felicity of each other, to the widest limits of their respective powers, and to increase in resemblance to perfection itself, throughout the endless ages of eternity.

"Glorious and delightful consummation! O the depth of the riches both

of the wisdom and goodness of God! How inexpressibly sublime the close of such a scheme, so worthy of its kind and all-perfect Contriver, so suitable to the character of the gentle and benevolent Messenger of the great design, the Father of the Age, the Prince of Peace. Isa. ix. 5. Well might the prophet exclaim, 'Break forth into joy, exult together, for Jehovah will comfort his people, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God;' Isa. lii. 9, 10. Well might the Evangelist call the instructions of Jesus, the glad tidings of his kingdom; Matt. iv. 23. Well might a messenger of heaven be represented as proclaiming these everlasting glad tidings to every nation, kindred, tongue and people that dwell on the face of the earth! Rev. xiv. 6."

In reviewing so largely the first of this Series of Essays, &c. we have been influenced by two considerations,—the one, our desire of affording the readers of our Repository a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Simpson investigates the sense of scripture,—the other, the acknowledged interest of the subject. We hope to be excused for briefly stating our sentiments on the question, whether the evidence usually alleged for regarding the finite duration of future punishment as a doctrine of revelation, be legitimate and satisfactory?

There is an obvious distinction between tenets which the New Testament is *by all Christians understood to teach*, and those which men are accustomed to receive as *matters of inference* from its contents: the former are, confessedly, authoritative and divine; it is possible that the latter may be nothing more than human theories and imaginations. We learn from our Lord and his apostles that there will be a resurrection of the just to happiness, of the unjust to suffering. Upon this head

there can be no dispute. It is an assurance of unrivalled magnitude. Who will say that the doctrine of universal restoration\* (assuming it, for a moment to be true) equals what we have now mentioned, either in the clearness of its proofs or in the importance of its application?

It has been the general propensity of believers in the gospel to seek for more in the records of their religion than those records were intended to disclose. This appears to have been the habit of the late amiable Cowper, as may be seen in a letter which he wrote on occasion of his brother's death; and we are of opinion that it is not entirely confined to the class of Christians among whom he ranked. When once a theological hypothesis has been framed, its author and its admirers feel no great difficulty in discovering that it best explains and reconciles certain passages of scripture: and, by a very natural illusion of the imagination and error of the judgment, they conceive that revelation evidently inculcates points of which perhaps the most we can with truth affirm is that they are not at variance with revelation. Hence many persons are confident of its being an article of Christianity that the future punishment of the wicked will issue in their recovery from sin and its direful effects; while some few maintain, with not less of positivity, that the language of the first preachers of the gospel, dooms to annihilation the impenitent transgressor.

We are far from censuring modest and sober inquiry on these

\* Or, by parity of reason, that of annihilation.

topics. But we protest against either the one or the other of the above conclusions being pressed upon us as an essential part of a Christian's creed; we protest against the belief of either being connected, in the minds of our readers, with the adoption or the rejection of certain opinions as to the object of worship and the terms of acceptance. To a reflecting person reasons will easily occur why Infinite Wisdom might see proper not to reveal more on this point than the simple fact that "God will render unto every man according to his works;" and our reception, severally, of the tenet of universal restoration, and of that of final annihilation, will not exactly indicate what are our sentiments concerning the nature of Jesus Christ and the efficacy of his death.

If we compare the two hypotheses together, we shall perhaps be sensible that the evidence preponderates in behalf of the former. More than this we cannot venture to assert. We can have *no infallible knowledge* respecting future rewards and punishments, beyond what is communicated in the Bible. Presumptions from the divine attributes and government, from the constitution of man and from some real or supposed analogies, though they may not be wholly destitute of weight, are inadmissible, when the appeal is made professedly to scripture; by employing them, we abandon, or seem to abandon, our avowed design, and are in danger of violating the simplicity of our reasoning and lessening its force. This is the common error of writers in the present controversy; and it is an error from which, as we have



before intimated, even Mr. Simpson does not appear to us to be altogether free.

There is a wide difference between erecting an article of faith on minute verbal criticism—a practice which we must strongly discountenance—and availing ourselves of such criticism, in order to shew that scriptural phraseology is not necessarily to be interpreted by the ideas and language of a modern age. To this latter object the author of these Essays, &c. has limited his attention. Though his own judgment, on the matters in discussion be already formed, he is, nevertheless, candid and usually discriminating. In his method of considering the topics selected by him, he has followed the examples of Clarke and Sykes on questions of yet greater moment. We shall not indeed affirm that he has traced the meaning of scripture with all the accuracy and learning of those celebrated divines, or with equal certainty. Still, his labours may guide and assist those of younger theologians, who, [however, will do well to recollect that even the rule of interpreting scripture by itself, requires a judicious and cautious application.

ART. II.—*Strictures on some of the Publications of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D. D.* Intended as a Reply to his Objections against the British and Foreign Bible Society. By the Rev. Isaac Milner, D. D. F. R. S. Dean of Carlisle, and President of Queen's College, Cambridge. London: printed for Cadell and Davies, &c. 1813. 8vo. pp. 419.

VOL. VIII.

“ In all accusations, whether public or private, when thou hast made a sufficient defence, enter not into needless matters of ostentation, or such further vindication as is not necessary.”\* Had the Dean of Carlisle acted upon this maxim, he would have appeared, in the present controversy with more advantage, both as a writer and a man. To the objections of Dr. Marsh against the British and Foreign Bible Society, he replies, no doubt, with considerable ease and complete success. This undertaking was neither difficult nor requisite: it was to slay the slain. Learning and ability very inferior to Dr. Isaac Milner's, had already obtained a victory over the most formidable of the Anti-biblists. The argument was intelligible to unlettered men, to the plainest and humblest capacities. We might therefore have been spared a volume which consists of five parts, besides an appendix; a volume of which much is irrelevant and much personal, in which we meet with numerous instances of tautology and egotism, and which, although it may display the talents of the author as a disputant, and serve to uphold his reputation within the precincts of his University, will not, we conceive, obtain any permanent existence among literary and theological productions.

The reasoning of the President of Queen's, is far better than his arrangement. But what we chiefly admire in his work, is the manner in which he speaks of Protestant Dissenters, and his inclination to

\* *Corbet's Self-employment in Secret*, an excellent Manual of Devotion and Christian Prudence.

commend, in one view, some of them whose religious sentiments greatly differ from his own.

"It is my decided opinion," says he, (p. 150), "that the differences among such Protestant churches as deserve the name of orthodox, can never be insisted on to any good purpose, unless the representation of them be accompanied with the statement of other important collateral truths,—such as, that the differences, either entirely, or nearly, respect subordinate matters; that there is an agreement among them in rejecting the grand errors and corruptions of the church of Rome; and that there is a further agreement in the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith and practice."

"In regard to such classes of Protestants as are not esteemed orthodox in their tenets, I judge it better to be silent. For although I am far from being disposed to speak of them either with animosity or disrespect, my knowledge of their several peculiarities in doctrine does not enable me to make the requisite distinctions without some danger of misrepresentation. The co-operation, however, of the Socinians with the other friends of the Bible Society, in the good work of disseminating Bibles, appears to me to be a notable instance of candour and moderation, worthy of the notice of believers of all denominations. They are supposed, in general, to prefer a different version of the scriptures; but if they have given up the lesser consideration for the sake of disseminating Bibles with greater advantage, churchmen surely will both be glad of the event, and approve of the principle that led to it."

We know whom the Dean intends to designate by the appellation *the Socinians*: and we should not have been sorry if, in this instance at least, he had made those enquiries, and been acquainted with those *distinctions*, which would have guarded him from the possibility of *misrepresenting*

their "peculiarities in doctrine;"—a sort of accuracy and justice that we might the rather have expected from one, much of whose time and attention has been devoted to the history of the Christian church.\* The *main fact* however is such as he describes it. *Unitarians*, in common with many enlightened men, both in and out of the Establishment, do not acknowledge the infallibility of King James's translation; yet, feeling as strong an attachment to revelation and its records as any of those, whether conformists or nonconformists, who, in our author's judgment, deserve the name of *orthodox*, they are willing to join in the most practicable measures for the circulation of the scriptures.

There is nothing in the present volume which we more disapprove than the eagerness of the Dean of Carlisle to animadvert on former publications of Dr. Marsh's. We shall not deny that those publications may be fairly open to censure; nor, universally, could we controvert the strictures which they have received from this writer. But we decidedly protest against the practice of an author's professing to answer, solely or mainly, certain positions of an antagonist upon a certain subject, and yet availing himself of that opportunity of questioning his merits in other departments of literature and of arraigning his arguments upon foreign topics. Dr. Marsh, it is true, had thrown out what the President of Queen's is fond of denominating a *challenge*: he had asked, "Whether his op-

\* See p. 175.

\* R. 273, 274.



ponents have laboured harder than he has done to promote the study of the scriptures?" A direct answer to this inquiry, would have been more pertinent and satisfactory than the recriminations which Dean Milner has employed in such abundance: and the honour of the learned dignitary, and still more that of his cause, would not have been endangered by his receiving this implied boast with the silence which it deserved. (262)

Biblical criticism is somewhat depreciated by the writer of these *Strictures*.\* It is a familiar maxim that "a man is against reason when reason is against him;" and we suspect that the Dean of Carlisle may occasionally find the test of Biblical Criticism an unwelcome application. Nevertheless, there is, in truth, no other method by which Protestant students and ministers can legitimately advance to the interpretation of the sacred text; and we so highly estimate Dr. Marsh's qualifications and services in this part of the field of theology that we heartily wish he had never quitted it for the devious and thorny paths which he has been fond of traversing. Election squibs and political pamphlets, are not more unworthy of such a man than anti-biblical publications.

On the abilities and skill of Dr. Isaac Milner as an interpreter of the scriptures we pass no judgment. But when he tells us that, even at a very early period of his academical life,† he would not join in a petition to the legislature, for relief from subscription to the-

ological articles which, at that time, it was impossible for him to have examined, we may be allowed to intimate that he was not likely to investigate the Sacred Volume with impartiality and effect. We are happy that he declares himself a believer in the doctrine of universal redemption.\* Yet the texts which he adduces in support of it, do not strike us as decisive of the question; they must be expounded, we think, of the fact of the gospel being embraced by Gentiles as well as Jews. The argument of the apostle in Rom. v. &c. might with more propriety have been cited by our author.

His eulogy on the Athanasian Creed is too curious to be withholden from our readers: (357).

"The creed, which takes its name from Athanasius, was composed for the express purpose of rejecting many ancient heresies, which it has accordingly done with admirable conciseness and perspicuity. And by the help of the parochial minister, even the poor and unlearned may be enabled to comprehend the meaning and to see the force of its several clauses."

We had no doubt of the Dean of Carlisle being an anti-catholic; and this sincerely at least, if not justly. But we did not expect that with his *Strictures* on Dr. Marsh's publications in regard to the Bible Society he would mix any declaration of his own opinions upon a topic so perfectly unconnected with his avowed design. Neither did we look for a section on his *personal infirmities* [of health], which, however, we sincerely lament, nor for any mention of his services to the Univer-

\* 264, &c. † P. 361.

\* Pp. 370, 374, 375.

sity, his Lectures on Chemistry, &c. &c.

He takes credit to himself, (298) for having, when Vice-chancellor in 1792, "by his vigorous exertions, effected the banishment of a very turbulent member of the University, on account of his disaffection to the ecclesiastical constitution of this country." At this distance of time, we shall not enter into the merits of the case, as it regards the accuser or the accused,—the learned and worthy person in whose exile from Cambridge the Dean rejoices. We will only beg our readers to mark *THE FACT*\* that, by the acknowledgment of Dr. Isaac Milner himself, "the Vice-chancellor in 1792" acted in the double capacity of procurer† and of judge: "by his *vigorous exertions* he effected the banishment" of Mr. Frend! His motives for speaking of this affair in his *Strictures on Dr. Marsh*, may be shrewdly conjectured by some who recollect the circumstances of the trial.

It seems to have been the singular lot of the President of Queen's College that "when Vice-chancellor in 1792," and "when again Vice-chancellor in 1810," he had to encounter the opposition of *turbulent* spirits and "outrageous offenders." Not being University men, we are perhaps more dispassionate observers and hearers of what passes on the banks of Cam and Isis than the inhabitants of those favoured spots. May we not therefore be permit-

ted to hint that an inordinate love of power, an injudicious display of authority, an unseasonable creation of new and obnoxious officers, might possibly aggravate evils which wiser measures and a more conciliatory spirit would have mitigated, if not prevented? It is not enough that the proceedings of men in high and responsible stations be *legal*: they must, at the same time, be the result of a truly liberal and comprehensive mind.

In these *Strictures* we perceive with concern many indications of a solicitude,—a restless solicitude,—about personal credit and importance: we meet with expressions of those "human passions" which, as we are taught by numerous examples, can disturb the quiet even of an University. The general fame of Dr. Marsh, as a scholar and biblical critic, as a man of talents and erudition, stands deservedly high not only in Cambridge but wherever learning is cultivated. Nor are the faculties and the acquirements of Dean Milner of a common order. Rivalries and jealousies, however, both literary and ecclesiastical, may haunt academic shades: and we fear that the controversy between these two eminent men will proceed, as it begins, much more in a discussion of matters respecting themselves, as clergymen and gownsmen, than in a calm consideration of the demands of the Bible Society on public favour.

The more we are acquainted with that Society, the stronger is our conviction of its simplicity, usefulness and moment. It is precisely for this reason that we de-

\* The readers of the antibiblical controversy are familiarized with *italics* and with *ROMAN CAPITALS*.

† Dr Kipling appeared as such in the process.



plore the inequalities of the Dean of Carlisle's Vindication of it, and the undue share which Dr. Marsh, as *Dr. Marsh*, obtains in his thoughts and strictures. Our patience will be almost exhausted, should his antagonist reply in an octavo volume, of four hundred and nineteen pages. Such a tax upon our time and feelings we most earnestly deprecate. We cannot be spectators of this conflict, unless the combatants engage with each other in moderately-sized pamphlets. And, were we members of their church, we would say to them, "Sirs, ye are brethren! Why do ye thus wrong your own reputation, and the interests of the *ecclesiastical constitution of this country*?"

N.

ART. III. *Two Discourses, the former of which was preached at the Unitarian Chapel, in Mosley Street, Manchester, Dec. 30, 1812. Before the Cheshire and Lancashire Unitarian Book Society, and the latter at the Chapel in Cross-Street, Manchester, January 10, 1813. By Joseph Bealey. 8vo. pp. 64.*

ART. IV. *Jesus Christ, a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with Grief. A Sermon preached at the Chapel, at Cockey, in Ainsworth, April 4, 1813. By Joseph Bealey. 8vo. pp. 28. Johnson and Co.*

These discourses derive a mournful interest from the untimely decease of their much respected author, and may be considered as

his bequest to his denomination and the world.

The last sermon is an eloquent and affecting picture of the humiliation and sufferings of Jesus Christ, considered as a proper man, and is a happy example of the power of Unitarian Christian principles, evangelically applied, to touch the tender passions, and to promote (what is sometimes called) experimental religion. Of the 'Two Discourses,' the first is a judicious statement of the importance of the Scriptures, and an earnest and persuasive exhortation to the study of them, founded upon the reasonableness and simplicity of their doctrines; and the second is a rational exposition of 2 Cor. iv. 4. and a practical view of the influence of "the God of this world," prejudice and interest, in blinding the mind and hindering the perception and acknowledgment of the truth. In the conclusion of this Discourse the author considers the unhappy effects of religious blindness, and thus modestly and movingly introduces the history of his own recent and well-known change of sentiment, with regard to the person and office of Christ:

"Other instances might be mentioned of doctrines, which are commonly accounted orthodox, which have a similar tendency and effect; but I shall rather proceed to notice a degree of obscurity which attends the doctrines that are generally called Arian, as they have been held by many. I hope no one here present will accuse or suspect me of wishing to assume any improper consequence to myself, if I take the liberty of speaking a little to this point from my own experience. Probably it may be known to some who now hear me, that the doctrines I have just mentioned are those which I have embraced through the greatest part of my life;

and I must candidly confess that I have always felt some degree of embarrassment arising from them. I trust you will excuse my mentioning one or two instances of this. It must be evident to all who are acquainted with the system, that there is a great degree of darkness attending it with respect to the nature of Christ in his supposed pre-existent state, of which no one has ever been able to form a clear and decisive judgment, upon any good authority.

"Again, with regard to his death, and the purposes which it was designed to answer; for my own part, I have never been able, since I have been capable of thinking seriously upon the subject, to believe that it was intended either to pacify the wrath of God, and dispose him to the exercise of mercy, or to satisfy his justice by paying, as it were, a full equivalent for the sins of men; nor was able to assign any other ends which it could rationally be supposed to accomplish, than to manifest, in the most affecting manner, the holiness of God's nature, and his hatred of sin, at the same time that he extended mercy to sinners; to give the most striking pledge and assurance of his readiness to forgive the sins of the truly penitent, by the solemn ratification of the covenant of grace; and thus to hold out the strongest encouragement and motive to repentance. Yet, I had a general persuasion that the language of scripture implied something more than this, which I was not able to explain; and, upon that principle, I have often quoted passages of scripture, or otherwise expressed myself in such a way as might naturally convey an idea of there being some further efficacy in the death of our Lord, without attempting to define wherein it consisted.

"Further, with respect to the agency of Christ in the government of the Church, regarding him both as the procurer and immediate dispenser of spiritual blessings, I have not scrupled to say that we were to look to him for them, in the exercise of humble faith; though both his own express directions, and the language, as well as the practice of his apostles, forbade me to encourage such an idea as that of praying to him for them; and I think it must be evident to every one that there is a considerable degree of confusion attend-

ing such views as these. I apprehend it is a certain matter of fact that those who are called Arians, have not, in general, been very explicit in stating minutely their sentiments, with regard to some important doctrines of Christianity; and I think it must appear, from the circumstances which I have now mentioned, that this is sufficiently accounted for by the embarrassments which result from the system itself, without charging those who embrace it with any wilful duplicity or disingenuousness; for it is surely impossible for any one to explain a subject fully and precisely to others, upon which he has not clear and definite conceptions in his own mind.

"Having ventured to say so much with reference to myself, I hope you will pardon me, and not attribute my conduct to a vain wish of giving any undue importance to my own views and feelings, but rather to an honest desire of serving the cause of truth, and of inciting others to serious inquiry, if I take the liberty of mentioning further, that about a year ago, I was incidentally led to give a more particular attention to one view of the agency of Christ, which was his being supposed to be, under God, the creator of the world, than I had ever paid to it before; the result of which was that I found myself compelled to relinquish the ideas which I had entertained upon that subject, as not being sufficiently supported by the scriptures. I then felt it to be my duty to enter into a more serious and close examination into the grounds of the general system which I had long adopted, and into the scriptural evidence which there is for what is commonly called the Unitarian doctrine, with respect to the person of Christ; against which I ought to be ashamed to acknowledge that I had hitherto indulged a general prejudice, so far as to prevent my giving it a fair and full examination.

"After much anxious, and, I hope I may add, serious and faithful application of my best powers of judgment to the subject, I was at length constrained to renounce the views which I had entertained with regard to the person of Christ, and brought to a full conviction that he was, in nature, only a man; though eminently distinguished from all other men, both by the unparalleled



excellency of his character, and by the high dignity and importance of his office, as well as by the extraordinary powers with which he was invested; and firmly believing this to be the genuine doctrine of the gospel, I cannot but feel it to be my indispensable duty, by all fair and honourable means, to recommend it to the attention of others, and to endeavour to promote its diffusion among my fellow christians. A consciousness of the prejudices which I have myself too much indulged, though I trust not from any wilfully wrong motive, ought indeed to make me exceedingly candid towards those who are still subject to their unhappy influence; but, at the same time, I think it ought to render me the more earnest in my endeavours to persuade them to divest themselves of all such improper prepossessions, and to examine the scriptures fairly and impartially, in order to learn thence what are the genuine truths of the gospel."

Mr. Bealey bears witness in several parts of these publications to the unusual spirit of religious inquiry now prevailing in Lancashire; and mentions ("Two Discourses," p. 36, 37) the late mission of Mr. Wright as contributing much to this happy change.

We cannot dismiss the Sermons without expressing our sympathy with the numerous surviving friends of Mr. Bealey; our hope that his true Christian example will long operate in favour of truth and righteousness; and our prayer that the Lord of the Christian harvest may raise up labourers in the place of this and other servants of Christ called to their rest!

ART. V. *Short Observations and Reflections upon select Passages of Scripture, for every Sunday in the Year.* By the Rev. John Tremlett. Vol. II. London. Sold by Johnson and Co.

St. Paul's Church-yard, and the Booksellers, Norwich. 1813. Price 4s.

With pleasure we hear that the reception of the former volume of this work [Mon. Rep. VI. 177.] has been so favourable as to induce the author again to employ his pen. Of the tendency of the volume before us we can speak with unqualified approbation: it unites, in the happiest manner, the strict morality and the amiable cheerfulness and tenderness of the Christian religion. The unadorned simplicity of its style shews that it is the pure effusion of the writer's own heart. The rational and pious parent will rejoice to call the minds of youth to "Reflections," so fitted to teach them the enjoyment of all that is excellent in this passing scene, and the attainment of that "crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give unto all them that love his appearing."

ART VI. *The Sufferings of Unitarians in former Times urged as a Ground of Thankfulness for their recovered Liberties.* A Discourse preached at Essex Street Chapel, July 25, 1813, being the First Sunday after "The Act to Relieve Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity" had received the Royal Assent. By Thomas Belsham. 8vo. pp. 54. Johnson and Co.

In this Thanksgiving Sermon, Mr. Belsham has drawn up a brief but interesting Unitarian martyrology, to which he has added some suitable and animated reflections.

The Sermon is printed by the Unitarian Book Society,—a distinction to which it is well entitled. It will be read with pleasure, not only by the members of the preacher's denomination, but also by all the friends of liberty; and we are happy in the opportunity of commending it to general attention.

The effect of the Trinity Bill is likely to extend beyond the mere repeal of persecuting statutes: the new law will give the tone to the public sentiment and language; and we confidently expect that in a few years Unitarians will be as little vexed with reproachful names as with political prosecutions. Since the Trinity Bill passed, indeed, a pamphlet has been published, in which the invidious and unhandsome epithet *Socinian*, is unsparingly thrown at them;\* but we consider this as nearly one of the last attempts to fix on them a name which they disown, and which they who use it know to be as inappropriate as it is offensive.

ART. VII. *A Speech*, intended to have been spoken at a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Leeds, on the *Catholic Question*, 22nd January, 1813. 8vo. 1s. Johnson and Co.

The author of this *Intended Speech* is Mr. Jervis, the Dissenting Minister, who, like many other of his brethren, has endeavoured to resist the "No Popery infatuation." The 'speech' is in the manly spirit of liberty, but at the same time in the softened tone

of charity. On a subject so thoroughly discussed, Mr. Jervis has given his pamphlet an appearance of novelty by the citation of a series of authorities,—ecclesiastics and statesmen of various parties, on behalf of the Catholic Claims.

One passage of the Speech we are at a loss to understand. The author disavows "hostility to the national church," and adds, p. 12,

"From my knowledge of Dissenters in general, it is only doing them justice to declare, as my unqualified opinion, that they are by no means inimical, but that they are generally friendly to the established religion of their country."

By the "established religion" is meant, we presume, the Established Church; but how can Dissenters be friendly to an Establishment, from which they separate, at no small cost, precisely because they conscientiously believe it not to be a pure Christian establishment?

ART. VIII. *Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge, delivered to the Clergy of his Diocese*, 1812. By John Disney, D. D. F. S. A. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Johnson and Co.

We have here another defence of the Catholic Claims and of universal Religious Liberty: the name of the author will be a sufficient pledge to our readers that the "Remarks" are judicious, pertinent, temperate, convincing and conciliatory. They are moreover seasoned with pleasantry, which renders them amusing and recommends the author's argument, which is close and solid.

\* "Dr. Watts no Socinian."



ART. IX. *The Importance of the Scriptures, and the Causes to which the general Mis-Interpretation of them is owing.* By William Johns. 12mo. pp. 60. Longman and Co.

Mr. Johns's object, in which he appears to us to have succeeded, is to establish the following rule in the reading of the scriptures,—

“—to receive what is plain and explicit as certain and indubitable; to reserve what is doubtful and obscure for further investigation; and, by no means and on no account, to wrest the sense of what is hard to be understood, so as to contradict that which is obvious and plain.” (P. 55.)

Examples of judicious interpretation of the scriptures illustrate and recommend the author's “Rule:” e. g.

“Acts xvii. 11. Many adduce the passage thus translated” (*strange gods*) “as a proof of the incarnation of deity: one of the four doctrines, according to Dr. Buchanan, (see *Christian Researches in India*) which the scriptures reveal the most plainly and explicitly of all others! This passage ought to be translated thus—‘Others said, he appears to be a proclaimer of strange (i. e. foreign) demons: because he preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection.’ By *demons*, the Athenians, being heathen idolaters, meant an intermediate order of beings between God and man, some of which were good and some evil. If therefore the incarnation of any deity be implied in the expression, it must be some Pagan deity or demon.” (P. 30.)

“John i. 1, is adduced in proof (of) the same doctrine (the incarnation of deity). It is alleged that no Unitarian interpretation of this passage is tolerable; that no Socinian torture will here serve our turn; but that on the orthodox or Trinitarian hypothesis every thing is easy, consistent and satisfactory. Let us try this passage fairly upon Trinitarian principles, and we shall soon see whether it will end in the consistency so much boasted of, or involve us in the most palpable absurdity. By *logos* or *word*, in the first clause, say the orthodox, is meant God the Son—the

second person in the Trinity; and by *theos*, God, in the second clause, is meant God the Father, or the first person in the Trinity. Now instead of the terms *logos*, the word, and *theos*, God, let us substitute the orthodox explanations, and mark the result. ‘In the beginning was God the Son, and God the Son was with God the Father, and God the Son was God the Father.’ Or thus: ‘In the beginning was the second person in the Trinity, and the second person in the Trinity was with the first person in the Trinity, and the second person in the Trinity was the first person in the Trinity.’” (Pp. 31, 32.)

“2 Pet. i. 4. ‘That ye must be partakers of the divine nature.’ If it had so happened that this expression had no where in the scriptures been applied to Christians, but that it had been said in reference to Christ, that he had been partaker of the divine nature (the very language assumed by reputed orthodox) how loud would be the language of triumph over the scripture-torturing Socinians; in how contemptuous a manner would every effort at explanation be treated, how hardly would it be asserted that they denied the very words of scripture in their plainest, most obvious meaning, and, in a word, what would not be said against them, infidels, deists, &c. &c. Yet notwithstanding all this, had it been expressly said of Christ, that he was partaker of the divine nature, and the expression had never been applied to Christians, nor supposed to be applicable to them, the Socinian torture would have been the only true method of explaining the expression, and it would not have evinced the deity of Christ, any more than it does at present the deity of all true Christians.” (Pp. 33, 34.)

We agree with Mr. Johns, (p. 43, *note*), that “to speak correctly, we should always say the *deity*, and never the *divinity*, of Christ. All Christians believe in his divinity or divine commission.”

Upon the whole, we know of no Unitarian tract fitter than this, to be put into the hands of serious, intelligent religious inquirers. To unlearned Christians it seems peculiarly suitable, since the author, though evidently a scholar, has

given all his criticisms, (and some of these are of no mean worth,) in plain English.

**ART. X.** *The Comparative Tendency of Unitarianism and Calvinism to promote Love to God and Love to Man*,—considered in a Discourse delivered at Brighthelmstone, on Wednesday, June 30, 1813, before the Southern Unitarian Society. By W. J. Fox. 12mo. pp. 34. Johnson.

Do we love a father or a tyrant? Does man win our charity more as a brother and co-heir, or as one of another *caste*, doomed by divine decree and hurried along by an Almighty hand to endless degradation and woe?

These questions appear to us to sum up the controversy between Unitarians and Calvinists; and we are happy to report that Mr. Fox has answered them with great pertinence and ability. His sermon is, indeed, of rare excellence. We cannot give an abstract of it, for it is itself a compendium of thought and argument; and for brevity and simplicity, as well as judicious reasoning and lively remark, we do unfeignedly recommend it to our readers, and to our (now, happily, numerous) Unitarian Book Societies.

**ART. XI.** *Charta Religionum*: A Chart of the Sects and Denominations into which the Christian World is divided. By John Williams Morris, Minister of a Congregation of General Baptists, Southover, Lewes. Folio Sheet, 1s. On Canvas and Rollers, 4s. 6d. Baxter, Lewes: Darton and Co, London. A Map of Religions is an inge-

nious idea: well executed, such a work would be a proper ornament for the walls of school-rooms and vestries. As a first attempt, the map before us has great merit, and we can honestly recommend it to our readers: in a second edition, we would advise Mr. Morris to be a little more precise in his definitions, to discard the names of some obscure authors, and to check an evident bias towards some of the denominations. In this last respect, Mr. Evans's *Sketch*, which the author professes to follow, is not a bad model for his imitation.

We like not the term *Humanitarian*. It is to our ears as the word *Trinity* was to John Calvin's, "barbarous." No Christians take it upon themselves, and therefore it is a needless distinction.

In such a work as this, a place should have been allotted to those Protestant Dissenters, increasing, we believe, in numbers, who, though not Quakers, deny the perpetuity of Baptism. A happy name is wanted for them; but until a better be found, they must, we suppose, be contented with that of *Anti-Baptists*. Of these, a sub-division, (not natives of Ireland either,) baptize without water; they may be called, vulgarly, *Dry Baptists*,—learnedly, *Pro-Baptists*.

**ART. XII.** *A Poetical Epistle to the Rev. John Grundy*, occasioned by his Lectures on the Doctrines of Christianity. By William Hampson. 8vo. pp. 16, 1813.

Mr. Grundy is, we apprehend, well known to our readers as an able and successful advocate of the Unitarian cause; in that character Mr. Hampson addresses him in



this "Poetical Epistle," which may not gain for the writer a distinguished place in the temple of the muses, but which assuredly entitles him to the better distinction of an enlightened, philanthropic Christian.

in his Political Register, of Saturday, May 15, 1813, entitled "The Trinity," with Remarks on his Political Writings, By a Friend to Christianity. 8vo. 2s. Mozley, Gainsborough; Longman and Co. London.

ART. XIII. *A Letter to Mr. William Cobbett, on an Article*

"A fit rebuke to a ludicrous Infidel."\*

## OBITUARY.

Aug 26, 1813.

*Mr. John Cross.*

MR. JOHN CROSS, (whose sudden and much lamented death was noticed on the Cover of the last Repository,) was born at Taunton, March 13th, 1745. His father died while he was very young; by which event the charge of him and two other children devolved upon his mother. She is represented as having been a woman of great worth and superior understanding; and from her he probably derived the seeds of that piety and conscientious regard to duty, which seem to have early and constantly distinguished him. He resided for some years with a respectable attorney at Nottingham; but I do not find that he ever entered regularly into the profession himself. When he was about thirty years of age he was received into the family of William Marquiss of Lansdown, (then Lord Shelburne,) in whose service, and afterwards that of his eldest son, he continued till near the death of the latter. He held (I believe) the situation of land steward; but for several years before the death of the old Marquiss, he was rather to be regarded as his confidential agent and secretary. His lordship spoke of him as his friend, and treated him with great consideration and kindness; and the recollections of that period were particularly interesting to the good old man, as his situation made him acquainted with several great and good men, such as Price, Priestley, &c. and gave him a personal knowledge of many of those characters which are distinguished in the annals of the times.

Soon after Mr. Cross left the Lans-

down family he came to reside in Exeter, about three years before his death. His amiable disposition, his evident desire to do good, and his willingness and readiness to be employed in the service of others in any way in which he could promote their welfare,—all deriving from Christian principles and affections that peculiar character which religion alone can give to benevolence,—soon procured him the esteem of all who knew him and were able to appreciate his worth. Among the young he was particularly beloved. Though often disabled by bodily indisposition from the enjoyment of social intercourse, he had none of the peevishness which too often renders old age a source of disquiet, and prevents its real excellencies from ensuring the reverence and love of the youthful mind: he had learnt patience and resignation in the school of affliction; and his piety, founded on just ideas of the character and dealings of Providence, supported those dispositions which made his hours of ease tranquil and cheerful. He delighted in seeing the young innocently happy; and still more in contributing to make them so.

Our friend was not distinguished by vigour of intellect; but he possessed great good sense, and an humble inquiring turn of mind; and as his judgment was not clouded by prejudice, or perverted by selfishness, his views of duty were clear, decided, and correct. The moral character often receives its peculiar features from the mental characteristics; and his virtues were not of the commanding kind: but they were

\* Title of Simon Browne's Remarks on Woolston.

such as to deserve and to conciliate respectful esteem.

At Lady-day last he became an inmate in my family. The memory dwells with mournful complacency on the little traits of benevolent kindness which marked his domestic character. He loved the playful simplicity of children; and he might often have been taken for the grandfather of mine. Always desirous to avoid giving trouble to others, always attentive to their comforts, he seemed to have no wish but to possess the affectionate regard of those with whom he resided: and that he did possess.—His time was so employed as to afford him much rational interest and improvement. He was constant in the discharge of the duties of piety. His first reading in the day was always directly religious, calculated to exercise and strengthen his Christian principles. He was next accustomed to read works of a serious but more argumentative description. His evenings he wished to spend, as much as he could, in cheerful social intercourse with his friends.

I cannot hesitate to speak of him as a conscientious, pious, benevolent, humble Christian; and with such a

character of mind, it is not wonderful that he should be able to look forward to his great change without dismay. In submission to the divine will, he wished that it might be sudden: and he was spared from those lingering sufferings, and that total loss of sight, of which he could not but be apprehensive.—Whilst on a visit to one whom he had described as his dearest friend, (Mr. Postans, of Sheriff's Lench, near Evesham.) he was suddenly called to his long home. As he was walking in the fields, he instantaneously expired, (in consequence of the bursting of a small blood vessel in the head,) without any appearance of suffering: and on the very evening when we had expected to welcome him to his home, I had the mournful satisfaction, of joining in paying the last mark of respect to his remains.

His income was very limited, but he made a liberal use of it. He regarded himself as accountable for all his talents; and he employed them as a faithful steward. He did good as he had opportunity; and I doubt not that he will meet with the approving sentence of his great Judge.

L. C.

---

## MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

### *The Christian's Survey of the Political World.*

---

A million of men in arms! This was blazoned forth to the world in our public papers soon after we had finished our last report. The armistice was broken, and another power entered into the lists of this desperate, sanguinary and miserable conflict. Thus is Europe, which boasts of being the most enlightened part of the world, disgraced: thus are nations professing Christianity testifying their obedience to him whom they call their Lord, and who is emphatically styled in their hallowed writings the Prince of Peace. Nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed since the kingdom of God was proclaimed, and the badge of its subjects was announced. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." Had this precept been duly inculcated on the minds of these combatants, is

it possible that such a number of professing Christians could have been collected together into one district for the purpose of destroying each other? But the ways of peace are not yet known: its advantages are not duly appreciated. The religion of Christ is in the mouths of all, but how little does it appear to be in their hearts.

We do not consider this subject as the worldly politician. It fills us with anguish for the deplorable state of mankind. The glorious light of the gospel has shone upon them, but men have preferred darkness to it. Hence Europe is in its present degraded state, from which it cannot expect deliverance, till, with a renovated heart, it turns to that gospel, which it has so long trodden under foot. Where are the ministers of the Prince of Peace? Where are the elect of God to pour



forth their supplications to their heavenly Father for their misguided brethren, and to implore a cessation of these horrible calamities!

The bloody battles that preceded the armistice seem only to have weakened the combatants in nearly equal degrees, and to one side a new prospect of success was opened. Austria it appears had offered its mediation, and a congress of ministers was expected at Prague. But negotiations were on a sudden broken off; the armistice was declared to be at an end, and Austria proclaimed, in a manifesto, her reasons for siding with the confederates; and the sacrifices she had made to her great conqueror were sufficiently known to the world. The only wonder was, that after an alliance, which raised her abject state, and her concurrence in the great war against Russia, she could have any other reason but the probable hope, that Buonaparte, weakened by the disaster of the winter and his opening campaign, would be now incapable of standing against the triple confederacy, assisted by the forces and the name of the Crown Prince of Sweden.

The great contest now is, which shall have the superiority in the affairs of Europe, France or Russia; and on the part of Russia we find her declaring herself in favour of independence and liberty. These are fine words; but whose independence and liberty does she mean? Is Poland, one of the once great powers in Europe, to be included in this term? If so, and as the Austrian Manifesto concurs in these terms, and Prussia by regaining her own independence will be happy to make some sacrifice, why should not these three confederated powers shew their zeal in the good cause, by each giving up the part of which their predecessors robbed the kingdom of Poland, and thus restoring it to its ancient independence, and to that constitution which it had formed for its good government. Buonaparte, from his matrimonial connection, was prevented from taking this step when he was in Poland, and Galicia was declared to be incapable of any arrangement, as he was bound by indissoluble ties to Austria to preserve to her her share of the plunder. His was the scheme of worldly policy without reference to justice. How noble will

it not be in the confederate powers to prove the sincerity of their views, by thus restoring liberty and consideration to an ancient state, and in fact preserving that balance of power, of which so much is talked by the unsuccessful, and so little is thought when the tide is in their favour.

But, if Poland is not to be considered in this unhappy war, the next question is, whether the French influence in Germany should be allowed to exist, and if not, in what manner is that divided country to be governed? Is it to be restored to that chaos of states, the ancient republic of sovereigns, under the name of the Holy Roman Empire? Shall Austria regain the title of Emperor, with increased powers? When Buonaparte is driven beyond the Rhine, this question will occasion no small embarrassments; and Russia, having gained such a footing in Europe, will not easily be retained within its ancient limits. But these things will naturally be overlooked in this country, whose interest it is conceived to be, that Buonaparte should be conquered, and France a second time blotted out of the map of Europe. We cannot entertain the least predilection for this soldier of fortune, nor a wish for any power, that depends for its support on military government, on the conversion of the rational man into a mere engine of destruction. We view the great conflict with awe, relying on that supreme Power, who when he chastises, remembers mercy. The judgments of God are on the earth, may its nations learn righteousness.

The north-eastern part of Germany is the *Aceldama*. The combatants have met, and they tell their miserable tale different ways. In the north the Crown Prince of Sweden had the command, and he has maintained his superiority in that quarter, not only preventing the French from seizing Berlin, but driving them back from several of their posts. To the south also the French met with repulses, and Buonaparte was called away from that quarter to head his army, threatened by the main body of the confederates, under the command of their emperors, marching against Dresden. They had driven in the French armies in the advance of that town, and were approaching to take it by assault, on the

very day that Buonaparte entered the place: and it is probable that his presence prevented the capture. The plan seems to have been laid with great judgment, and had it succeeded, the blow struck would have been decisive in the campaign: even in its failure some advantages were gained, which placed Buonaparte in a different situation from that in which he has hitherto been accustomed to astonish Europe.

The French by the military tactics they adopted with their Revolution overcame the powers opposed to them, who persisted in that system, by which they acquired great glory, as it is called, in arms. Thus in former times the Greeks, attached to their phalanx, fell an easy prey to the quickness of evolutions of the Roman Legion. But the repetition of defeat has instructed the confederate powers, and in this campaign they have pursued the French method, not waiting for the attack, but disposing their forces so as to act through a great extent of country. Thus they have a plan of their own to pursue, which every where interferes with that formed by Buonaparte: these chess players are brought nearer to equality than they have hitherto been, and there is no small probability that Buonaparte will be beat at his own weapons.

The river Elbe is the grand scene of all their actions. Various affairs had taken place upon it, which distracted the attention of the French, and the confederates, according to their well concerted plan, marched upon Dresden, and their balls fell in the town. They were repulsed after a very severe conflict, and a battle took place the next day, the result of which, according to the French account, amounted almost to a complete rout, and an immense loss of men, ammunition and baggage. One fact, however, is certain, that the move made by the confederates was not attended with the desired success: they were compelled to retreat into Bohemia, but in that retreat, by a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, they met with a large detachment of Buonaparte's army, which they put to the rout, taking the commander, several generals, and all their ammunition and baggage.

On balancing the accounts therefore of the contending parties, there is as

yet no great occasion to boast on either side. If the churches of France resound with *Te Deums* on the two victorious days before Dresden, the tower guns have announced the successes of the confederates on the following days, who most probably have addressed the God of Hosts with equal praise and equal sincerity. But not to have been completely beaten, to have made such a stand, to be prepared for another attack, gives the preponderance in favour of the confederates, who, if they continue to act in concert, may drive the potent emperor from the Elbe, and in that case follow up their victories to the Rhine. The charm of invincibility is broken. The Russian winter, if it has not tamed the hero, has diminished the terror of his name. His legions, brought to act merely on the defensive, will be thinned by desertion, and the fact of the battalions of Westphalia, and of several officers of distinction going over to the confederates, must fill his mind with anxiety. Something more decisive will soon appear, and Germany will groan for years under a military government of one kind or another. Whether it will gain by the exchange of French for Cossacks time will prove.

In Spain the French have been completely foiled in their attempts to relieve the town and fort of St. Sebastian, which after a very brave defence fell by the assault of the former, and the surrender by capitulation of the latter. The town was made a mass of ruins, in consequence of the cannonade of the besiegers; and after its capture the guns of its defenders were turned upon it from the fort. The capture of this place was of great consequence to the allied army, as now Pampluna is the only fortified place remaining in possession of the French in the northern part of Spain. The ill success of the repeated attacks on Lord Wellington, will damp the ardour of the French, and the surrender of Pampluna is hourly expected. The French in the interior of Spain may then be expected to fall an easy prey to the conquering armies of the allies, and Spain delivered from the French may begin to resume its place among the powers of Europe. The Cortez however have not yet removed from Cadiz to the capital, but it cannot be expected to remain long in its present posi-



tion. Its gratitude to the great deliverer has been manifested in titles and largesses, but we do not hear of the crown being offered to him. Whoever shall possess it will find it very different from what it has been under the wretched government of the Bourbons. The people have now acknowledged rights, and there is a mixed constitution. But still the clergy have too much influence. The formation of an auxiliary at Madrid, to our Bible Society would be a great advantage, and the spreading of a Bible in Spanish without note or comment may be a great measure in the recovery of that kingdom from its intellectual darkness. The bravery displayed by the Portuguese, and their free intercourse with the English, cannot fail also to have some effect upon their government, so that on the return of peace, the Peninsula will make a different appearance, from what it has done under the mismanagement of the two last centuries. But its influence in America will be cut off, and it must now depend on its own internal resources.

The Americans have found that the conquest of Canada is no easy matter, and that it would have been better to suffer a little inconvenience under existing calamities than to increase it by an appeal to arms. Their debates upon this subject shew, that they follow too closely the systems of the old world. Their attempts with Torpedoes have not hitherto had any success, yet they have been made with a great deal of industry. A bold adventurer has advanced with them near to one of our large ships, but he has found it not quite so easy to *bell the cat*. He does not however despair, and the Americans entertain sanguine hopes of his success, not recollecting that our ships having been forewarned will keep too good a look out to suffer the approach of any boat with such an implement of destruction in it. The spirits of alienation from the mother country continues to increase in Spanish America.

During the suspension of the mind from the sanguinary conflicts abroad several atrocious murders at home filled it with horror. Two of them were distinguished by the remarkable confessions of the unhappy perpetrators: of whom one imputed his guilt to a diabolical impulse, and the other

maintained his innocence to the last of the murder, though he confessed that he was present at the scene. This notion of diabolical impulses is sanctioned by the writings of many learned men, and countenanced by our courts of law: yet we cannot but regret that it should find so much support in the higher, and should be brought into action by the lower classes. The worthy Granville Sharp was a great patron of this fanciful notion, which according to him was the cause of many of the actions of princely cabinets. But surely the passions of men uncontrolled by religion are sufficiently active without this foreign agency. Nor can we imagine the devil to have had more influence on the poor footman's mind than on that of the officers convicted of, and sentenced to death for, the murder of a brother officer in a duel. These latter murderers were saved from the gallows by the clemency of the Prince, who accompanied his pardon with a strong sentiment of indignation at their atrocious conduct, which was ordered to be read to every regiment in the service. They were all cashiered, and the most guilty of them was rendered incapable for ever of serving his majesty. By a strange prejudice these officers escape the abhorrence that is felt for the crime of Nicholson, who is supposed to have acted under diabolical impulse; yet surely if that is the case he is rather the subject of our compassion than those gentlemen, who in cool blood instigated their associates to murder each other.

The Unitarian Fund has had a meeting on the repeal of the act in support of the Trinity, and passed several appropriate resolutions on this subject. Mr. Alderman Goodbehere presided on this occasion, and the meeting did not confine itself to congratulations merely on the repeal of the act, but testified their wish and hopes that every man, whatever might be his religious sentiments, might equally participate in every civil right with the rest of his countrymen. This is the true sentiment of Christian liberty: for all, who under the name of Christian, or of any particular sect of Christians desire under the former title to exclude non-Christians, or under the latter title to exclude Christians of a different denomination from themselves from civil

rights, shew themselves to be unworthy of the Christian name, and make their religion a pretext for that lust of power and that pride of domination, which are expressly forbidden by our Lord and Master. The attention of the Committee, in whom originated the application to parliament, was not forgotten, and in fact this matter ought to have been settled at the time of the agitation on Lord Sidmouth's bill. As it was then neglected, the committee very properly took it up, and though the act has never been and was not ever likely to be enforced, yet it was very proper, both for the sake of the country, and those who deny the Trinity, that such an act should no longer disgrace the statute book. A disposition has appeared indeed on the part of some Unitarians to make more of this business than it deserves; to cry it up as a most wonderful favour granted to Unitarians, and as a prodigious argument of the increased liberality of the times: but the fact is that the existence of the act was almost unknown in the country, more known indeed by far by Dissenters than Churchmen, and the Trinitarians had been for many years

ashamed of it themselves: It is to be recollected, that this act was not originally made against these Dissenters of the three denominations, or that body which goes under the name of the Dissenting Interest, for at the time of passing the act they were all Trinitarians; but against Churchmen, of whom many at that time as is the case now, denied the Trinity though they regularly attended the service of the Church, and professed to be its members.

Te Deums are singing on all sides for murderous battles: the thanksgiving of every pious Christian will be offered in this country for real blessings, for the bounty of Providence in a most plentiful harvest of every kind, got in under very favourable circumstances. When heaven thus showers down benefits, let not man be ungrateful. Let him manifest love not only to his friends but to his enemies, and thus hasten that time, when the swords shall be turned into plow-shares, and the spears into pruning-hooks. May thy kingdom O heavenly Father quickly come and thy will be done, here as it is in heaven!

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

The Obituary of the Rev. JOHN SIMPSON of Bath, we are sorry to postpone till next month, for want of room. Also two or three Articles of Intelligence.

We hasten to correct an undesigned misstatement in the Obituary of the Rev. W. Severn, (p. 550), concerning the treatment he received from his Father on his joining the Methodists. We are assured, from the best authority, that the behaviour of his family on that occasion was kind and liberal.

---

## ERRATUM.

In page 536, col. 1, line 43 and 52, for the Rev. John Kentish, read Rev. George Kenrick.

---